

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

INVESTIGATION OF SO-CALLED "BLACKLISTING"
IN ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY—REPORT OF THE
FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.—PART 2

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

JULY 12 AND 13, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INDEX IN PART 3 OF THIS SERIES)



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1956

82833

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY,
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri
CLYDE DOYLE, California
JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee
EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois
BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York
DONALD L. JACKSON, California
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*

CONTENTS

PART 1

| | Page |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| July 10, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| John Cogley----- | 5175 |
| Afternoon session: | |
| John Cogley (resumed)----- | 5208 |
| July 11, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| Arnold Forster----- | 5227 |
| Frederick E. Woltman----- | 5240 |
| Afternoon session: | |
| James F. O'Neil----- | 5256 |
| George E. Sokolsky (statement)----- | 5287 |

PART 2

| | |
|----------------------------------|------|
| July 12, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| Vincent W. Hartnett----- | 5291 |
| Afternoon session: Testimony of— | |
| Roy M. Brewer----- | 5312 |
| Paul R. Milton----- | 5327 |
| July 13, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| Paul R. Milton (resumed)----- | 5329 |
| Godfrey P. Schmidt----- | 5353 |
| Afternoon session: | |
| Victor Riesel (statement)----- | 5367 |
| Francis J. McNamara----- | 5368 |

PART 3

| | |
|---|------|
| July 17, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| Afternoon session: | |
| Gale Sondergaard (Mrs. Herbert Biberman)----- | 5390 |
| July 18, 1956: Testimony of— | |
| Jack Gilford----- | 5401 |

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * * 17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * (q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEE

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations, of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF SO-CALLED "BLACKLISTING" IN ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY—REPORT OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.—PART 2

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.
PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities convened, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, of California; Harold H. Velde, of Illinois; and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Committee staff present: Richard Arens, director, and K. Baarslag. The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

I understand that some of the members are on their way, so that we will get started.

Mr. ARENS. Will Mr. Vincent Hartnett please come forward? Would you remain standing while the chairman administers an oath to you?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HARTNETT. I do.

TESTIMONY OF VINCENT W. HARTNETT

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. HARTNETT. My name is Vincent W. Hartnett. I am 40 years of age. I presently reside in New York City, and by occupation I am a talent consultant especially to the radio and TV industry.

Mr. ARENS. Would you give us, if you please, Mr. Hartnett, a characterization or description of your functions as a talent consultant?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes. In the course of my occupation or profession, I compile research material on actors, producers, directors, writers, and so forth, in the entertainment industry, not only as to their general talent background but also with special reference to any Communist Party or Communist-front affiliations.

Mr. ARENS. How long have you been engaged in this profession, Mr. Hartnett?

Mr. HARTNETT. Professionally engaged, sir, in any regular sense since September 1952.

MR. ARENS. Give us, if you please, a brief summary of your background, your education, and any professions or occupations in which you have engaged prior to your present occupation.

MR. HARTNETT. Yes. I was a graduate B. A. and also M. A., maxima cum laude, both from the University of Notre Dame; and I think I should add that I did special postgraduate studies in the Theory and Practice of Bolshevism under the late Dr. Waldemar Gurian.

I began to compile files on the Communist movement prior to World War II. During the war I served on the highest levels as an officer in intelligence posts in the Navy. I was separated from the naval service finally with the rank of lieutenant commander.

After the war I was a free-lance writer and also engaged in public relations and fund-raising work, and in 1948 I went into radio. My first job was as assistant to the executive producer of a leading radio independent producer, Phillips H. Lord, Inc., and I became supervisor of the Gangbusters radio program. I left the Gangbusters program at the end of June 1949, directly as a result of a Communist issue, and I began to compile extensive files on the subject and then became a consultant.

MR. ARENS. Mr. Hartnett, I should like at the outset here in your testimony to read you an excerpt from Report on Blacklisting, page 93, volume II, Radio-Television, by John Cogley of the Fund for the Republic. This report, in alluding to you, makes the following statement among other things:

Hartnett may be the most widely criticized man in the radio-TV industry, because he is frankly in the business of exposing people with "front records" and then later of "clearing" them—or as the Times writer delicately put it, "advising them on how to counter pro-Communist allegations."

Are you conversant with the fact that this language does appear in the report?

MR. HARTNETT. Yes; I am, sir.

MR. ARENS. Is this a truthful characterization of yourself?

MR. HARTNETT. No, sir. It is a falsehood.

MR. ARENS. What is the truth?

MR. HARTNETT. The truth is that I have never been in the business of acting as a clearance man, so-called, for any performers. I have never solicited, have never received, and would never accept any compensation of any kind from any individual who sought my help or to whom I offered my free services to help rehabilitate himself. This is an enormous falsification.

MR. ARENS. By "this," what do you mean?

MR. HARTNETT. This statement. It is hardly an innuendo. It is almost a direct statement that I am in the business of extorting from people.

MR. SCHERER. Do you mean the statement from the Fund for the Republic report on blacklisting?

MR. HARTNETT. Yes, sir. It accuses me of threat and ransom activities. It is an outrageous falsification.

MR. ARENS. What are your fees for your services?

MR. HARTNETT. I am employed directly by several leading sponsors in radio and TV. I have been employed by a motion-picture studio, by a couple of law firms, by a network on a regular basis, a couple of advertising agencies.

My fees to my clients as I have enumerated are ordinarily \$5 for a first research check. I am not an investigator. I am a researcher. Two dollars if a name is repeated to see if any new information has come upon the record; if the report is extensive, \$20. I could name the cases on one hand where there has been an extremely tedious amount of research. For example, I was asked by a client a month ago about Arthur Miller. That report was more than 33 pages and I charged more than \$20 for it. It took about 2 weeks.

Mr. ARENS. What are the sources of your information?

Mr. HARTNETT. First, of course, the reports of State and congressional investigating committees. They are the backbone of any consultant's library; secondly, an original collection of literature issued by the Communist Party and many, many Communist-front groups. Third, a large collection, one of the best in the country, of theater literature, literature pertaining to productions in the theater. Fourth, of course, newspapers and magazines and periodicals. Fifth, to a lesser extent, actual eyewitness reports of Communist-front meetings, rallies and parades.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever in the course of your professional life, solicited any one with a Communist or Communist-front record to employ you to quote "clear" that individual?

Mr. HARTNETT. Sir, this question was raised in the pre-trial examination in my \$200,000 lawsuit against John Crosby and the New York Herald Tribune. It had such currency that I began to look at myself a second time. I have gone over my records and files and searched my memory and will say flatly under oath I have never done that.

The CHAIRMAN. If you pick up some of the newspapers tomorrow you may find that your enormous falsification will be not enormous falsification, but that you have confirmed the findings of the report.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever, Mr. Hartnett, accepted compensation of any kind from the individual whom you have helped to rehabilitate himself?

Mr. HARTNETT. Sir, because I am under oath, let me be precise. My services were once sought by a good friend of mine, a good anti-Communist newspaper writer, Victor Lasky, who felt that Yul Brynner, the famous director and actor, had been unfairly treated. I met at Longchamps, 49th Street and Madison Avenue, New York, with Mr. Lasky and Mr. Brynner, and, over my protests, Yul Brynner paid the luncheon check. That is about the only case of that kind.

In the case of an executive of Decca Records, he felt that he had been unjustly labeled. I met him, assisted him, and he sent me one phonograph record. That was compensation. I didn't want to be sent it.

Mr. ARENS. Before we proceed further, may I ask you 1 or 2 general questions. Do you feel, Mr. Hartnett, that there is a legitimate place for private individuals and private organizations in the process of routing Communists and pro-Communists from the entertainment industry?

Mr. HARTNETT. If I didn't feel that, sir, I wouldn't be doing what I am doing, because this was forced on me. My present profession was not of my choice.

I was in a situation originally as a radio producer where I became conversant with the operations of what we call the Communist apparatus. I began to acquire information and I began to be deluged with phone calls and requests for information from many sources. They became so great in the period 1950 to 1952 that I finally had to, for self-protection, charge very modest fees.

Let me say this: that in spite of the tremendous information uncovered by this committee, which is, of course, an object of opprobrium to the Communists—they dread investigations, especially by this committee—in spite of that, in spite of all the investigations conducted by both State and congressional committees, I would say that not more than 5 percent, not more than 5 percent of the past and present Communists in the entertainment industry have been uncovered.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Hartnett, may I quote to you some language appearing on page 97 of volume II?

Mr. SCHERER. You say that, with all of the investigations conducted by this committee and similar committees, that we have uncovered only 5 percent of the Communists in the entertainment field?

Mr. HARTNETT. I would think that is correct, Mr. Scherer. I have made a tabular analysis of records, and I would think it is no more than 5 percent of past and present Communists.

Mr. SCHERER. And we have been accused time and time again, as you know, of exaggerating the menace.

Mr. HARTNETT. Let me put it this way, if I may, Mr. Congressman. In the New York local of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists approximately 30 members have been so far identified before this committee by sworn testimony as Communist Party members; no more than 30. Yet the minimum voting strength of the progressive, so-called caucus in AFTRA is about 400. They have a steady, reliable vote, election after election, of 400. Not all of those are party members. Some are sympathizers.

That means that at present, people who will consistently go along with the party, number 400 in the New York Local of AFTRA.

They are not all Communists. Probably the actual Communist Party members number 150.

Then you have a Communist bloc in Equity. You have a Communist bloc in the American Guild of Variety Artists. The vast majority of these have never been named before any congressional committee.

Mr. ARENS. I have often made the observation that there is no expert on communism, that there are experts on various phases of the Communist conspiracy.

On the basis of your background and your specialized experience in this one facet of the Communist operation, would you express to this committee your opinion, your judgment, and your appraisal as to the degree to which the Communist Party is, at this instant, in penetration in the entertainment industry? How serious is the menace of Communist penetration right now in the entertainment industry? That is your specialty.

Mr. HARTNETT. Among the older established performers, producers, and directors, of course there is no progressive infiltration. Those people have chosen sides long ago. The extreme danger is with the young people coming up, especially those in their late teens and early twenties, particularly boys and girls from out of town who come to

New York and who work in a few off-Broadway theaters. They find that it is advantageous to their careers, if not to become party members, to at least be "progressive" and vote along with the Communist fraction and sign petitions and the like.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean they are afraid they might be blacklisted if they do not do it?

Mr. HARTNETT. Well, it hasn't come to that yet. They are afraid that, if they don't go along with this, they won't get the job opportunities.

Mr. SCHERER. We had some testimony in Los Angeles that that did happen in Los Angeles a few years back, namely, that there were many in the Los Angeles area who went along with the Communists out there because, if they did not, they felt that their careers would be stymied.

Mr. HARTNETT. That is correct, Mr. Scherer. That is a very difficult problem that I will have to say Mr. Cogley did not treat of in his report.

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I was going to say. The report of the Fund for the Republic says nothing about that; nor does it say anything in that report of the blacklisting of Herbert Fuchs, who was mentioned by the chairman the other day. There is a man who, when he refused to cooperate with this committee, the university said they would stand behind, because he was a good professor and a good teacher. The minute he cooperated with this committee and gave us some of the most valuable testimony that this committee has ever had on infiltration into Government, they fired him.

Yet this report of the Fund for the Republic says not one word about that type of blacklisting.

Mr. HARTNETT. Congressman, I saw a couple of sad cases of that. For example, one individual whom I listed in Red Channels, which was published and edited by the Counterattack people, was the then well-known radio-TV writer, Allan Sloane. Sloane initially filed a lawsuit against my book for libel, claiming he had been libeled by mention of a couple of Communist affiliations. Subsequently he came before your committee and admitted he had been a hard-core Communist Party member. Since that time Allan Sloane has not, to my knowledge—and I am supposed to be an expert, I keep casting figures—to my knowledge, Allan Sloane has not worked for the firms for which he used to work. He has done the Navy Log Program on television in the last season, the Navy Log Program, and Allan Sloane, by the way, is a dedicated liberal anti-Communist; but, as far as my information extends, he did not obtain employment from the people who had given him employment before he testified.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you an explanation as to why the report of the Fund for the Republic did not cover that type of blacklisting?

Mr. HARTNETT. There are some allusions, more in the first volume on motion pictures, of blacklisting on an unorganized or disorganized scale of anti-Communists by Communists, and "Progressives." I know it is not played up in this volume on radio and television. I must say in general that there is, as George Sokolsky put it, an inadequacy of research in the book. The book betrays an amateurish grasp of the radio and television industry. This is not remarkable because, after all, it is a difficult field.

As General Twining said when he came back from Moscow, there is no great knowledge of the Communist conspiracy. There are varying degrees of ignorance. Some of us are less ignorant than others, and Mr. Cogley, I am afraid, is quite ignorant.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the review of this in the Brooklyn Tablet is the best description I have seen, that it is dull and amateurish. That is what The Tablet calls it.

Mr. HARTNETT. Congressman Walter, Mr. Cogley never seems to get to what I think is the base of the whole issue: Is there a Communist apparatus, conspiracy, or movement in radio and TV? Is it evil? Should we do something about it? How should we do something about it? He didn't seem to start from that.

The CHAIRMAN. He would not call it evil. He would call it a political party the same as the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

Mr. ARENS. Will you answer those questions now, Mr. Hartnett? Is there a Communist apparatus in the entertainment industry?

Mr. HARTNETT. No one has to take my word for it. There has been sworn testimony before this and other committees to the existence of such an apparatus and, when the members of this committee interrogated witnesses in the Foley Square hearings in August 1955 one witness after another took the fifth amendment when asked if he had knowledge of such a Communist caucus.

Mr. ARENS. How serious is the Communist penetration of the entertainment industry? What is your appraisal?

Mr. HARTNETT. That is a very broad question.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Could I break it down?

Mr. ARENS. How much of a menace is the Communist penetration of the entertainment industry?

Mr. HARTNETT. I would like to start with, for example, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists. That is the performers' union in radio and television.

As I said before, numerically, party members do not impress one. Let us say that in round figures there are about 150 actors, members of AFTRA, under party discipline in the New York local, but there are 5,000 members of the local.

Out in Los Angeles this problem is well under control. In Chicago there is not much of a problem in the midwestern AFTRA, but the difficult thing is some of the Communist Party members, as always, insinuate themselves into positions of great influence where they are able to—

Mr. ARENS. How great is the influence of Communists in the entertainment industry? Is it negligible? Is it appreciable? Is it significant? Is it a menace or is it not a menace?

Mr. HARTNETT. It is a significant thing. I wouldn't want to overestimate the menace because I think that there are forces in the industry itself which recognize it. The situation, however, is complicated by the presence in such as the New York local of AFTRA of individuals who are anti-Communist in the abstract. They are opposed to sin but, when it comes down to opposing individual Communists or those under Communist discipline, they won't do it. Instead they tend to run guard for the Communists. In other words,

while the Communists will carry the ball, you have 5 or 6 alleged liberals who will knock out the opposition.

Mr. ARENS. On page 97 of volume II of this report appears the following:

Hartnett's position on blacklisting is clear: he is for it. Like many others, he balks at the word but accepts the fact. Not long ago he stated his belief that "no provable Communist Party member or provable collaborator of the Communist Party should work on radio or television."

Do you care to comment upon that statement?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, that is my statement. Like everyone else, I resent having a dirty term, an epithet, improperly attached to a practice which in itself is laudable.

Mr. ARENS. What are you speaking about?

(At this point, Representative Clyde Doyle left the hearing room.)

Mr. HARTNETT. The word "blacklisting." Blacklisting is a nasty term. You might just as well, for example, say that the newspaper which prints records of court cases, like the New York Law Journal, is blacklisting. It says that such and such a man is remanded to jail. You might say that the Better Business Bureau is blacklisting if it turns in truthful and accurate records on phony businessmen. You might say that Dun & Bradstreet is blacklisting when it gives a bad credit report.

The term "blacklisting" originally had a hard and fast meaning in labor circles, and to attach that to honest, intelligent, reasonable, and fair patriotic efforts to keep subversives out of radio and television, I think is a dangerous slanting.

Mr. ARENS. Let us come right to the heart of the matter, please, Mr. Hartnett. On the basis of your background and extensive experience, are people being unjustly accused of Communist activities in the industry and thereby being deprived of employment opportunities? Is there a practice of that going on?

Mr. HARTNETT. There have been a few isolated instances which have come to my attention of confusion of identity, and I will mention one case. It won't harm the man to mention the case. It might hurt him.

Mr. ARENS. You mean it might help him.

Mr. HARTNETT. Right. It may help him. In the New York run of *Silk Stockings*, there was an actor by the name of Philip Sterling, S-t-e-r-l-i-n-g. I have known Phil Sterling from radio circles for a half dozen years. Unfortunately, as it happens there was a writer for the Communist press who used the pseudonym Phil Sterling; and Phil Sterling called me up one day and said he knew he was in trouble, he was able to work on Broadway but not in television. I asked, "Could you drop around to my office on 42d Street?" He said, "Sure."

Some of my clients had asked me about Phil Sterling, the actor, and I knew he was not Phil Sterling who worked for the Communist press. I tried to figure out what to do about it. The obvious thing was to put out a report.

I am criticized for interviewing actors or trying to elicit their comments, but how else could this man get the word around that he was not the Phil Sterling of Communist literature? I put out a report to my clients pointing out that he was not the other individual of the

same name. Phil Sterling, the actor, is fine. It so happened there was one minor thing that I wouldn't even discuss. He was a splendid fellow to my knowledge. There have been other such cases.

Mr. ARENS. Is this a general or isolated instance?

Mr. HARTNETT. An isolated instance. The same thing might happen in business. They might confuse Joe Jones, the haberdasher, with Joe Jones, who operates a stationery store.

Mr. ARENS. This industrial epithet "blacklisting" then embraces the efforts of people like yourself and of patriotic organizations to preclude Communists and those in the Communist apparatus from being in the entertainment industry.

Mr. HARTNETT. It is being used as a blanket term for both the good and evil.

Mr. ARENS. How effective is the process of disassociating Communists and those in the Communist web from the entertainment industry?

Mr. HARTNETT. Sir, that gets to the heart of your whole problem and it is something that Mr. Cogley again didn't seem to grasp. Patronage is of the essence of Communist success in the entertainment industry. In the entertainment industry you have always more qualified people for jobs than you have jobs. Therefore, the Commies, beginning in the middle thirties, began to operate a patronage mechanism. They were able to take Communists and sympathizers, for example, from the Group Theater in New York and give them the "magic carpet" to the west coast and Hollywood, and build them up in jobs. You didn't have to be a party member. That helped. They were able to build up people. They were able to insinuate themselves in positions of authority as casting directors and directors and producers, so that those who would go along with the Commies without necessarily joining the party, just signing petitions, being as they say "progressive," these people would get preferential treatment. This is commonly known in show business.

Mr. SCHERER. We had ample testimony on the west coast from many people that that was the practice.

Mr. HARTNETT. So that the secret, in my opinion, of defeating communism, and it is not the only means of doing it—there are many things—exposure and so forth, possibly some legislation, I am not sure; that is not my field. But to my mind the dagger thrust to the heart of the enemy here, the Communist movement in the entertainment industry, is to cut this patronage apparatus. Once 98 percent of the people in show business, 95 to 98 percent of the people, are convinced that it is no longer profitable or popular to go along with the Communists, they won't do it. You always had some few—I don't know the exact percentage, I have never worked it out—people who would go along, as they say, with the Communists because it paid off. You have to stop that. This, to my opinion, is the most significant thing about the security procedures in the entertainment industry.

They are not aimed at an individual as such. Oh, yes, it is true that a performer who is a party member is able to make money and contribute to the Communist cause. He can make speeches. I am not minimizing that.

But the main thing is that communism is all an integrated apparatus. The security procedure is not aimed at hurting the individual. It is aimed, in my opinion, in an overall strategic point of view, it is

aimed at breaking up the patronage apparatus that the Communists have created.

The CHAIRMAN. The thing that has been so serious, as I see it, after thinking over the west-coast revelations, is the large sums of money raised from these performers, all of which goes into Communist organization work. That is the very serious situation, of course.

Mr. SCHERER. Along that line that the chairman mentioned, who was it, what actor in New York, testified that he contributed \$40,000 to the cause?

Mr. HARTNETT. Robert Rossen, the producer.

Mr. SCHERER. \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Many of these people were assessed a percentage of their incomes, and, strangely enough, it went to the Communist Party in New York and the Communist Party diverted it to Communist-dominated labor unions.

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Aside from the question of filling the coffers of the Communist Party, do you, as one who has specialized in this field, have any appraisal to make as to the seriousness of Communist penetration of the entertainment industry for other reasons?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, sir. There has been testimony, most of it correct but some of it lacking in depth, as to the "inability of the Communists to put propaganda on the air," and I say that is not entirely correct because it is a too-simplified formulation of propaganda. Certainly the Communists do not try to extol Marxism-Leninism over the air, but we did have instances, for example in 1947, when Norman Corwin made his One World Flight, of pro-Soviet propaganda.

The Communist tactic is the use of parallelism. Let me give you an illustration, if I may, of what I mean by parallelism.

Mr. SCHERER. We had some testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. No; you go ahead.

Mr. HARTNETT. Let us take a motion picture, for example, which is being shown on television now. It is not a Communist movie. The Ox Bow Incident. In the Ox Bow Incident, I think some innocent men are lynched. Lynching of innocent people by vigilante groups, misidentification, this can be used by the Communists to insinuate over a period of time by repetition that in most cases the wrong individuals, innocents, have been identified, or, as they say, "persecuted," by congressional committees.

Another way of insinuating the same idea was used on a television show February 18 or 19, 1956, directed by a director who is mentioned in this book by Mr. Cogley and who has worked for the Ford Foundation. This was called Tragedy in a Temporary Town. Tragedy in a Temporary Town was a story of the brutal beating of a young Puerto Rican by an intemperate, fanatic group of vigilantes who wrongfully identified him as an individual who had tried to assault a teen-age girl. Let me give you a couple of quotes from that program. They talked about "the committee," just "the committee." It was a committee of three engineering workers. Then they said: "No one has a right to do what they are doing. There is the police and there are the law courts."

Then they talked about "the committee of three stupid men." Then there was a dialectical extension, to my mind. I am admittedly hypersensitive to this because I am in contact with it all the time; I am sure it would sail right over the heads of a lot of people; maybe I am wrong. They talked about this: "When some other pigs come for you some time."

That line was delivered by Lloyd Bridges who admitted before this committee he had been a party member at one time but said it was brief and he was out.

Mr. SCHERER. Who directed this?

Mr. HARTNETT. This was directed by Sidney Lumet. He was one of those innocently, wrongfully accused, according to Cogley. But the insinuation—it is a matter of opinion, I want to state in all fairness—the insinuation was that if private groups or committees try to apprehend people or administer justice, it is going to become unfair and innocents are going to be caught. I mention this because it is now a theme repeated on television again and again and, if you have time, but you probably don't in your duties, to watch television, you will find script after script in which the policeman shoots an innocent teen-ager, not the bad teen-ager. It is always the innocent. The wrong man is identified and sent to jail. An honest official abroad is suspected of being a Communist agent and the man who points the finger at him is always a fanatic, disgruntled.

In other words, if you could believe television, our courts are incapable of convicting the right man, our witnesses are incapable of making a positive identification, our juries are incapable of coming in with the right finding, private citizens are incapable of making a right evaluation. We are being brainwashed.

Mr. ARENS. I invite your attention to volume II, pages 92 and 93, in which the case of a Miss X is recited, Miss X being, according to this report, some actress who engaged you to assist her in some of her difficulties in the industry.

Do you have a recollection of that particular case of Miss X?

Mr. HARTNETT. Very clearly, sir, and again you have an outrageous falsification, a distortion, a suppression of some of the evidence?

Mr. ARENS. By whom?

Mr. HARTNETT. By Mr. Cogley. He crops evidence like some unscrupulous politicians crop photographs.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you call that McCarthyism in reverse?

Mr. HARTNETT. It is termed McCarthyism in reverse. It is outrageous. It is as if, for example, you were to take a photograph of a criminal in a court being sentenced by the judge and crop away from the photograph all the background and make it appear as if the judge is shaking hands with the man. It is outrageous.

Mr. ARENS. The language in the report on pages 92 and 93 speaks for itself, and the apparent intent is evident to any reader. In your own way tell this committee the facts.

Mr. HARTNETT. Right, sir. Under date of May 12, 1953, one of the top public relations men in the motion-picture colony, Arthur P. Jacobs, of Beverly Hills, Calif.—well respected, and represents Humphrey Bogart, Santayana Productions—wrote me and said:

DEAR MR. HARTNETT: At the suggestion of Roy Brewer and Howard Costigan I am writing this note to see if you would be kind enough to help me with some information about one of the clients of this office, Kim Hunter.

Miss Hunter has been with this office since she appeared in the Arthur Koestler play, *Darkness at Noon*, and only recently I have been informed that it is possible she was connected with some leftwing organizations earlier in her career, which, if true, should be cleared up at this time.

I am sure Miss Hunter is not sympathetic to the left cause as her many talks with me have convinced me of this—as well as the fact that she has appeared in the violently anti-Communist play, *Darkness at Noon*.

Could you let me know if it would be possible to get any information on her previous activities—which I am sure Miss Hunter will be most anxious to clear up. Also, I would be interested in knowing if there would be any costs involved in obtaining this information.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the photostatic copy of the letter which Mr. Hartnett just read be marked "Hartnett Exhibit No. 1" and incorporated by reference in this record, since it has been read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Hartnett Exhibit No. 1" and filed for the record.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Under date of May 15, 1953, I replied to that letter:

MAY 15, 1953.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: This will answer your letter of May 12.

A quick look through my files reveals that the name of Kim Hunter (Emmett) has indeed been linked with a number of activities officially cited as Communist front.

It reflects also that Miss Hunter's name has been used in connection with a dubious activity as recently as March 1953.

Further research by me would be necessary in order to insure a complete report, and to authenticate information. The fee for such a complete report would be \$200.

This is one of the cases that I said I could count on the fingers of one hand. That amount of research would take me 3 days to prepare.

This includes a thorough analysis of Miss Hunter's leftwing connections in the theater, as well as her listed affiliations with activities cited as Communist front. It also includes photographic copies of key exhibits. If she really wishes to correct her past mistakes, she will have to review her entire record—whether obtained from me or from whatever source she wishes. There are a few other experts in this field, in addition to me, who would be able to make such an analysis. I imagine their fees would be the same as mine, and in some cases a bit higher.

I am sure you and Miss Hunter, who is a talented young woman, realize that no individual and no agency or committee can "clear" her. That is a job she alone can do—not merely by a statement acknowledging and repudiating past mistakes, but by concrete pro-American acts. For her country's sake, for her own sake, and for her admiring public's sake, I hope she will do so.

Sincerely,

VINCENT W. HARTNETT.

Let me explain that Mr. Jacobs is a highly paid public-relations man. He doesn't work for free. Had Miss Hunter come to me directly, I would have been glad to sit down and talk with her and advise her. Here is not Miss Hunter but a public-relations man from the west coast who probably makes 5 G's a year on this account. On some accounts, his probable retainer is 50 G's a year. I said I could make a report for him, and I think I would be a complete ass if I did it for nothing.

(The above letter was marked "Hartnett Exhibit No. 2" and filed for the record.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Then I got a phone call from George Sokolsky. Sokolsky told me that he had heard a rumor third-hand that I had

offered to sell Miss Hunter for \$200 copies of letters which he had written to her or she had written to him. Luckily he checked with me. Also the report went to Victor Riesel. I am not suggesting here what Mr. Forster apparently was understood mistakenly to suggest, that there was a ring. The fact is that somehow or other the word was spread around, apparently from a talent agent in New York, that I was trying to blackmail Miss Hunter. Sokolsky was decent enough to check with me and I assured him I didn't even know of such letters, it was entirely not the truth, and I sent him photostatic copies of the correspondence.

I then called on Jacobs.

I wrote Art Jacobs on May 25, 1953, and I said that I had heard about this and I wanted to know if he had started this smear on me that I was trying to shakedown Miss Hunter, and he phoned me back and said he certainly had not, that he realized my position was entirely reasonable but that Kim Hunter having consulted with her agent in New York was told that she didn't have to do anything about it, that it would all blow over.

I wrote back to Mr. Jacobs, on May 29, 1953, thanked him for his kindness in setting this smear against me to rest, and I thought that ended the matter.

You will notice that Mr. Cogley, reporting this at the end of paragraph 1 on page 93, has four dots. The four dots, Mr. Arens, indicate omission of the vitally important part of my letter in which I said that I couldn't possibly clear Miss Hunter, that she could only clear herself, and that I hoped she would do so by concrete anti-Communist actions. That appeared in the Cogley book as 4 dots and it wasn't 4 dots. Cogley further says her attorney had written me. Her attorney never wrote me. It was a high-priced public relations man.

(The letters referred to by Mr. Hartnett were marked "Hartnett Exhibits Nos. 3 and 4" and filed for the record.)

MR. ARENS. Are you one of these men who brings the damning indictment against the person and then exercises your power to heal the wound?

MR. HARTNETT. This, sir, could mean anything or nothing. I have written a number of articles for various magazines—I think five articles in particular for the Sign magazine, for the American Legion magazine, and for American Mercury—and in these I have gone into some detail about Communist operations in the entertainment industry. I have named names. I have given records.

This is one on Broadway that I did for the American Mercury. I was also the coauthor of Red Channels. I wrote File 13, volume I, referred to in the Cogley book, which gave records of individuals. That was a highly specialized book. This is the second volume of File 13. There will be about 10 volumes in all.

If that is to create records—I don't know what he means.

Even Mr. Cogley admits I am a thoroughgoing researcher. I am honest. I have a master of arts degree, maxima cum laude, in this field. And certainly I do compile records.

He then talks about "healing the wounds." My door is always open to any person who is involved in the Communist movement who wants to come to me. I will give an example.

About 3 years ago, one of my clients proposed the name of George Hall, H-a-l-l, to me, for a television show. On the record, George Hall had only a couple of very insignificant Communist-front affiliations, very slight. However, I knew that George Hall had been a member of the Midtown branch, Midtown Club, of the Communist Party about 1946-47. I wrote a letter to George or called him on the phone and I said, "Can we meet? It is very important I talk with you."

So I took him to lunch and I said, "Look, I want to assure myself. I think you are out. I don't think you have been a member of the CP, the Communist Party, for a couple of years but I have got to be sure of it in justice to my clients and because I have a double duty. I have a duty first of all as a citizen, and as a former naval intelligence officer I have a sworn duty to uphold the Constitution. They may take me as a zealot or fanatic, but I try to do it. I have a duty to protect my client from any unfounded protests. If the protests are founded and I make a mistake, let people protest."

In this case I said to George, "I want to protect my client and I also want to be sure from an Americanism point of view you are all right."

We had a long talk. He said he had written to this committee, which he had, offering his services.

If that is called healing the wounds, I accept it. I healed the wound. I helped the guy. He got rehabilitated.

After he appeared before the committee as a friendly witness, the only friendly witness in August of last year, the party tried to have him hounded out of his job as a standby in the Broadway show, The Boy Friend. Luckily the management stood up for him and would not blacklist him for testifying. George is now in California on the road tour of The Boy Friend. He is fine. He got rehabilitated. He is acceptable on TV as far as my clients are concerned.

MR. ARENS. I would like to get these questions answered as precisely as you can as an expert in this field.

Question No. 1 is: In your judgment, using the phrase blacklisting as used in the report, how many people have been blacklisted wrongly in the entertainment industry; and, secondly, how many people have slipped through the net and are still in the entertainment industry who are Communists or in the Communist apparatus? Could you give us your judgment?

MR. HARTNETT. This would be, again, a lesser degree of ignorance. I am constantly accumulating new research material, constantly acquiring new information so that I am able to identify as party members people who previously were not known to me or not found in the public record as party members. As to the wrongfully accused, I have issued one invitation after another to newspaper reporters in New York, to people in the entertainment industry, and I have said, "Name me two people wrongfully accused." So they come up with two people from Red Channels, Jean Muir and Irene Wicker. I say, "How is Jean Muir wrongfully accused?"

"Well, Red Channels made allegations against her which she denied."

I say, "Wait a minute. Do you know that Jean Muir voluntarily appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, that she was interrogated about seven of the affiliations listed in Red

Channels? Two were not covered. She admitted every one. She denied having attended the Communist Party study group, or rather, she admitted she attended it but said it was not willful and with knowledge on her part. She admitted she had loaned her car to Lionel Stander and a couple of other Communists but said she did not know them as Communists at the time. She denied ever having contributed funds to the Communist Party as it had been testified she did. In other words, she admitted, in effect, more than charged."

Jean Muir has been away from the Communist movement for several years now. Her last activity of any kind was in 1947 when a fund-raising party for the Hollywood Ten was held at her apartment. I think she thought again they were wrongfully accused.

They were all Communists and she thought they were wrongfully accused. She is a fine woman and if it were not for the fact that she is a very sick woman she could be working in television.

Cogley said she was cleared and can't work. Cogley is such an ass. She can't work because she is a sick woman. It is a condition where water accumulates in her system. The woman can hardly get up and cannot stand the strain of a rehearsal. She is not blacklisted.

Her husband, Henry Jaffe, the attorney, could open door after door for her.

Mr. ARENS. Is there another case of a person whom it is alleged had been wrongfully blacklisted?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, Irene Wicker, the Singing Lady. How this man, Cogley, can get his facts crooked. Pardon me. I will calm myself.

This account is a classic example of how to not tell a story.

Red Channels, the book I coauthored, carried one citation only on Miss Irene Wicker and that was, "Reported as a sponsor of the Committee for the Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis to the New York City Council." That was in September 1945.

I knew when I set that down in the book that Irene Wicker was married, her second marriage, to Victor Hammer, his second marriage. Victor Hammer was a son of one of the founding members of the Communist Party. Old Doctor Hammer was such a big wheel in the party that he used to pay the rent on the party headquarters in the old days. I have a memory on these things—I am older than I look—whether by direct or indirect knowledge.

Miss Wicker had married into what had been the aristocracy of the Communist movement. I knew that.

I also knew that Miss Wicker in June of 1946 had lent her apartment for a fund-raising gambling party for the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, one of the top fund-raising arms of the Communist Party. JAFRC must have raised \$500,000 for the Communist Party.

I knew also that in September 1946, she and her husband had taken a whole table at \$100 a plate at the Waldorf for a fund-raising luncheon for the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. I knew this from witnesses and I had photostatic copies of checks from the gambling party.

I could not use that in Red Channels because it was not a matter of public record. The publisher might be sued because it was not a matter of public record.

In October of 1949, I had written an article for the *Sign* magazine—it was published in October 1949—in which it was merely stated that Irene Wicker had sponsored various leftist causes.

Following the publication of that article in October of 1949, Miss Wicker, that is to say, Mrs. Victor Hammer, through her brother-in-law, Armand Hammer, A-r-m-a-n-d, protested to the *Sign* magazine that she had not been affiliated with leftist causes. The editor asked me to prove what I said.

I said, "Here is the citation from the *Daily Worker* about the Benjamin Davis campaign. Here is the information about the gambling party and about the \$100 a plate fund-raising luncheon at the Waldorf."

She said about the committee for Benjamin Davis in 1945, "I have never seen it before."

I said, "All right. You go to the *Daily Worker* and have them publish a correction and I will be happy to circulate it."

Initially she said that she wasn't at the Waldorf, had never been there. I said, "Miss Wicker"—this was going through channels—"I have two witnesses who were there as your guests at the table."

Finally she admitted she had been there but pleaded good faith. I knew this, I had information. Then she did not secure any correction from the *Daily Worker* and, frankly, I believed that she had lent her name knowingly to the Benjamin J. Davis campaign. I believed the public record was correct because she made no effort to secure any correction from the *Daily Worker*. Therefore, it was put in *Red Channels*, only the one citation. There was other information, but only the one public citation was used.

Red Channels was published on June 22, 1950, that is to say 7 months after the initial incident with Irene Wicker. She then stated, if quoted correctly by the *New York Post*, that this was the first time she had heard about the Benjamin J. Davis committee, whereas in a letter 6 months previously we discussed it.

Here is how Mr. Cogley gets into the act with his "trained seal" routine. He makes it appear that *Red Channels* had stated that Irene Wicker had signed the Communist Party nominating petition for Benjamin Davis. *Red Channels* never stated she had signed a nominating petition. *Red Channels* said that reportedly she had been on a committee for his nomination. This is the old tactic of setting up a strawman and knocking it down.

Irene Wicker's husband went to the records of the city of New York and had a check made and said, "She is not on the nominating petitions. She is unjustly accused."

We never accused her of signing a nominating petition. It was the old tactic of setting up a strawman and knocking it down.

Mr. ARENS. Answer question No. 2: How many, in your judgment, are in the entertainment industry today who ought to be, even using the term of Cogley, "blacklisted" because of Communist activities?

Mr. HARTNETT. I would hate to go out on a limb on that one, Mr. Arens. I would hate to try to make an approximation. That is something I could prepare.

Mr. ARENS. Is it a substantial number?

Mr. HARTNETT. Of actual people under Communist discipline?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

(At this point, Representative Doyle returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, sir; it is, in the entertainment industry as a whole who are still working.

Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARTNETT. Let us go into cases.

Mr. ARENS. I do not want to take time to go into each individual case. I want your judgment and appraisal as an expert in this field. Is there a substantial number of people through the mesh right now?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes. They get through the mesh because they have no known records of affiliation with any organization on the Attorney General's list or the House committee's list, the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications. They are getting smart. Since the passage in 1950 of what is known as the Internal Security Act not many people will affiliate or remain affiliated with an organization on the Attorney General's list. You have off-Broadway groups. You have informal groupings with no name at all, or they will affiliate with a group which you have not cited. Let's take the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, one of the most subversive groups in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Is that the organization of which a man named Clark Foreman is president?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes. This organization does have some affiliates from the entertainment industry.

I won't pick up the book but, if one reads the Cogley report—the "white paper on communism," that is what I would like to call it, the "white paper on communism"—you read this, and you will see the name of J. Raymond Walsh, a commentator. From the Cogley "white paper on communism" it would appear that Mr. Walsh is wrongfully accused and deprived of his job. I want to make sure of my facts. I must get the citations. Here is a commentator with a very significant Communist-front record and who even recently has been affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. This is a man who, as I say, recently, that is to say after the Korean war, still was active in the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. Yet, according to Mr. Cogley, he was wrongfully accused. There is no mention in the Cogley report that Walsh has had a record since the outbreak of the Korean war.

Mr. ARENS. On page 96 of volume II, the report makes reference to a letter which you are alleged to have written to an actor by the name of Leslie Barrett. Would you kindly recite to the committee the circumstances of that letter and compare what you regard as the facts in comparison to the recitation of the situation in the Cogley report?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes, sir.

As one means of acquiring information, I tried to make it a point to photograph the May Day Parade in New York each year because, as you Congressmen have said, it is an annual mobilization of Communist strength.

One of the photographs of the 1952 New York May Day Parade showed a group of individuals who were obviously in the entertainment industry and presumably in radio because one of the placards being carried in the contingent said, "Stop the Blacklist in Radio." I did not know, when I first looked at the positive, and I could not identify any of the people in the photograph.

At a meeting one night, happening to meet with some actors who are well informed on the subject and have been in show business for some years, I handed around the photographs and said, "Could any one make any positive idents on any of the people in the photographs?" Two of the people gave as their opinion that it looked like Leslie Barrett in one photo, but they weren't sure. I then wrote Mr. Barrett, and I would like to give you for your files a complete copy of the correspondence.

MR. ARENS. Would you hesitate for just a moment there? You say that in this parade one of the hues and cries of the celebration was to stop blacklisting?

MR. HARTNETT. Yes, sir.

MR. ARENS. What do the Communists mean by the term "blacklisting"?

MR. HARTNETT. Denial of employment to Communist Party members and "progressives"; no question about it.

MR. ARENS. Is that part of the Communist Party line at the present time to identify with the odious term "blacklisting" the deprivation of employment of Communists and those in the Communist conspiracy?

MR. HARTNETT. Yes. They have no exclusive on the word "blacklisting" but, as spelled out in party literature, Political Affairs, Masses and Mainstream magazine, and so forth, "blacklisting" is a term used by the Communists as well as possibly others to describe denial of employment to known, unrepudiated party members, and "progressives" who are not actual party members.

I want to make the point, though Cogley seems not to get the point, that at no time in the history of the Communist movement have all activists been party members. I am sure Congressman Velde, from his experience, knows that most of the people in espionage nets had not been party members. If they were, they dropped out. Some had not been. They were safer that way.

MR. ARENS. They were in the party discipline but not technical members, as you and I might join the Rotary Club.

MR. HARTNETT. Correct. Cogley seems not to know that the cadre of Communist strength consists of more than Communist Party members. It also includes those under discipline.

MR. ARENS. Would you kindly revert to the letter that is described here on pages 95, 96 of the Cogley report which you are alleged to have written to an actor by the name of Leslie Barrett. Tell us the circumstances surrounding that incident.

MR. HARTNETT. Barrett's name had previously been proposed to me by a number of clients and I had said that I had no derogatory information against him prior to December of 1954 when, as I say, two of my friends thought that this looked like Barrett, might be Barrett, they thought it was Barrett, words to that effect, but they weren't sure. I had been criticized, following the publication of Red Channels, by the so-called liberals for not first checking with people and giving them a hearing, so I have been trying to give people a hearing and my head has been beaten in.

On December 9, 1954, I wrote Mr. Leslie Barrett, 56 West 71st Street, New York, as follows:

DEAR MR. BARRETT: In preparing a book on the Left Theater, I came across certain information regarding you.

A photograph of the 1952 New York May Day parade shows you marching just to the right of (name deleted).

It is always possible that people who have in good faith supported certain causes come to realize that their support was misplaced.

Therefore, I am writing you to ascertain if there has been any change in your position. You are, of course, under no obligation to reply to this letter. As a matter of fact, I am under no obligation to write you. However, my aim is to be scrupulously fair and to establish the facts. If I do not hear from you, I must conclude that your marching in the 1952 May Day parade is still an accurate index of your position and sympathies.

I am enclosing a 3-cent stamp, and would appreciate the courtesy of your reply.
Sincerely.

I sent this first-class mail in a sealed envelope with scotch tape so that no one else would open it, and marked it "Personal and Confidential."

Mr. ARENS. This was pursuant to inquiries you had received from some of your clients as to whether or not Barrett should be employed by them?

Mr. HARTNETT. It was two things: first of all, because I wanted to ascertain whether this was he; secondly, because I am preparing a book on the Left Theater and I wanted to have my facts straight. Here it is. [Shows book.] It is true that I stated that the photograph showed him marching in the parade. I did not know that it was he. Those of you with experience as interrogators know that it is the standard operating procedure to say to someone, "Why did you do it?"

If you say to a person, "Were you in Joe's delicatessen, and did you take a bologna sandwich?", he will say, "I have never been near the place."

If you have reason to think he has, you say, "Why did you take the sandwich?"

It is a trick. My experience is if you come up flat to someone who is a suspected party member and say, "Were you ever in the party?" he will say "No."

Following the publication of Red Channels I was asked to talk to Abe Burrows as a favor, no money involved. He denied that he had ever been a Communist, or ever attended Communist meetings. Subsequent testimony indicated that he had been a Communist and he testified before this committee in equivocal terms. That is a standard experience we have all had.

As the former counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York said, "They all lie to you" so the thing you try to do is put it as a fact and ask for an affirmation or denial. It is an interrogating technique. I wrote him and wanted an answer. Again I said: "If I do not hear from you, I must conclude that your marching—" Of course, I couldn't conclude it morally or legally. I shouldn't have said it in the letter. Again, it is a technique. I was trying to help the fellow. I wanted to be fair and wanted an answer because many times I will write to these people and they will never answer the letter.

We had a long correspondence. I was convinced that it was not he, and, as a matter of fact, he subsequently worked for some of my clients.

Mr. ARENS. How do these facts, as you have just recounted, square up with the recitation of those facts in the Cogley report?

Mr. HARTNETT. He omits most of it.

Mr. ARENS. Now, I invite your attention to the section of the publication beginning at page 173 of volume II, in which the Fund for the Republic report tells of a series of blacklisting experiences, and ask you whether or not you can identify the facts and the individuals, in any of these cases of serious blacklisting experiences recounted here?

Mr. HARTNETT. The first case, the leading actress, Miss H., by context can only be one person, Uta Hagen. I would say offhand that she was connected with around 25 to 30 Communist-front groups. She is a former confidante of Paul Robeson. She was married to Jose Ferrer and that broke up the marriage.

(The letter dated December 9, 1954, to Mr. Barrett, read by Mr. Hartnett, together with attached copies of related correspondence was marked "Hartnett Exhibit No. 5" and filed for the records of the committee.)

(Present in the hearing room: Messrs. Walter, Scherer, Velde, and Doyle.)

Mr. ARENS. Are there any other in the anonymous cases.

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes. The radio actor K. L., mentioned on page 175, volume II, I would make an educated guess that is Mr. Alan Hewitt. All the facts aren't given. There is no bill of particulars.

Mr. ARENS. We do not want speculation.

Mr. HARTNETT. I am sure it is Alan Hewett. Since there are no particulars in Cogley's account to defend against, I cannot comment on it.

The next one, radio-TV director, MP, I can't identify. The context is too vague.

Mr. ARENS. Is there any conspiracy or collusion between yourself and Fred Woltman, or among yourself and Fred Woltman and Victor Riesel and George Sokolsky and James O'Neil, of the American Legion, in which you wield a power and influence in concert in depriving people of employment and then healing the wounds?

Mr. HARTNETT. First, I will take Fred Woltman. I will say this much: that Fred Woltman struck a great blow for the patriotic cause in July of 1949. He did a marvelous article for the World-Telegram of July 18, 1949, in which he discussed the case of William M. Sweets, who had been my director on the Gangbuster show, who was very active in Communist causes.

Mr. Woltman did interview me about the Bill Sweets case. I gave him what facts and documents I had. He wrote a magnificent article called Reds Colonizing in TV and Radio.

Possibly since that time I have met him at social functions and meetings, or called him on the phone, five times since 1949.

In other words, if I had what I thought was a good item about a Communist maneuver, I would call him or Nelson Frank, or Victor Riesel because these people are columnists who know the score. They are anti-Communists and they have a wide following.

As far as any collusion in any sinister sense goes; no. That is the context.

Mr. ARENS. Would the same apply with reference to George Sokolsky and with reference to James O'Neil, of the Legion?

Mr. HARTNETT. I have met George Sokolsky at social functions. I talked to him on the phone a couple of times. I think I have been at his office once, possibly, to tell him about something, again some

maneuver by the Communists, something I thought was important that would be of interest to his readers.

But as far as any collusion of conspiracy for a clearance apparatus; No. Sokolsky used to forward to Jim O'Neil—I forget the sequence, but originally they, I think George Sokolsky—used to forward to supposed leading anti-Communists letters from people in Hollywood in which they "explained" their past Communist or past Communist-front affiliations.

I received possibly 30 such letters.

Subsequently James O'Neil, I think, would just pass these along. You could take them or leave them.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Hartnett, have you read the Cogley report?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes; volume II.

Mr. ARENS. I ask you now on the basis of your background and experience in this field of Communist penetration of the entertainment industry, to give this committee your appraisal of whether or not the Cogley report is objective, fair, and honest in its presentation of the facts?

Mr. HARTNETT. Omitting any references to myself, let me say that the man is either woefully ignorant or he is a rogue. I know Mr. Cogley would say this is being black and white, polarizing things; it is too simplified; I lack philosophical penetration; I can't see the ramifications.

But there it is—he suppresses, consistently suppresses, evidence, and he crops the evidence which would be against his case, that is to say, that people are being wrongfully accused and we ought to let the poor Communists alone. He suppresses facts and puts forward distorted versions of evidence in favor of his thesis.

For example, on page 179, volume II, he talks about a director, David Pressman. He talks about a director, J. R.

Mr. ARENS. Who does?

Mr. HARTNETT. Cogley in his "white paper on communism." He says:

Before Red Channels, J. R. had built up a considerable reputation in television. * * * J. R.'s first task was to prepare a pilot kinescope for a new show. He did this using two actors who had been listed in Red Channels.

This is more than an educated guess. That director is David Pressman.

Why doesn't he name David Pressman? Because David Pressman is one of the top directors in the Communist movement in the cultural field. Don't take my word for it. [Picks up documents.]

For example, here, "Signed Communist Party nominating petition. On the social staff of Communist Camp Unity."

Mr. ARENS. Does the report or reference of this case point out an illustration of a person who has been unjustly blacklisted?

Mr. HARTNETT. Yes; he (Cogley) talks about the trouble he (Pressman) had with these two people. Just because they were in Red Channels, he could not use them on the show. Who were they?

Mr. ARENS. You tell us what are the facts with reference to the case of J. R. who the report indicates has been so wrongfully abused, this sad case of J. R. Tell us what are the facts of J. R.

Mr. HARTNETT. I think J. R. could only be one man, David Pressman, who has a strong Communist record. In January 1947, he

directed the cultural portion of the Lenin memorial meeting in Madison Square Garden.

Cogley says that he (Pressman) used two actors who were listed in Red Channels. Who were the actors? J. Edward Bromberg and Sam Wanamaker.

Bromberg tried to kid your committee. He pleaded a heart attack and then went out to Ann Arbor to work.

Sam Wanamaker had a record of about 40, at least, Communist-front affiliations. If he is not a Communist Party member, he ought to take the sign down. Wanamaker jumped the United States when another committee of Congress had a subpoena out for him.

These are the two men. Why should a sponsor use them in his television show? Pressman consistently used, tried to use, some of the most notorious Communists in the business on the show "Treasury Men in Action." He finally got the heave-ho from the show.

Now he has been directing this summer down in Playhouse in the park in Philadelphia. This is a man with a very strong record.

As Cogley says in the "white paper," he is a fake because he still masquerades on television. He comes in and another man will front for him.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, that will conclude the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. What is on the program for this afternoon? We have a rollcall.

Mr. ARENS. We have three witnesses en route to Washington. Although we anticipated they would be here by 2 o'clock to testify, we have just been advised this morning that because of plane and train connections they will not arrive in time to testify before 3 o'clock.

So I suggest that with the approval of the committee and chairman, that the committee reconvene at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any more witnesses at this time?

Mr. ARENS. No more witnesses this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the committee will stand in recess until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

(Present in the hearing room at the conclusion of the morning session Messrs. Scherer, Velde, Walter and Doyle.)

(The committee recessed at 11:25, July 12, 1956, to reconvene at 3 p. m., same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1956

(Committee members present: Representatives Frazier, Scherer, and Doyle.)

Mr. DOYLE (presiding). The committee will please come to order.

By virtue of the power and authority vested in him as chairman of the full committee under Public Law 601, Chairman Francis E. Walter has constituted a subcommittee for this afternoon's work, consisting of Mr. Frazier of Tennessee, Mr. Scherer of Ohio, and myself, Mr. Doyle of California, acting temporarily as subcommittee chairman.

Call your first witness, please.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, if you please, Mr. Roy Brewer has assumed the witness seat here and I respectfully suggest that you administer the oath.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BREWER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROY M. BREWER

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. BREWER. My name is Roy M. Brewer, and I am now residing in Stamford, Conn., and I am employed as the manager of the branch operation for Allied Artists Pictures Corp., with offices at 1560 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Brewer, give us, if you please, a thumbnail sketch of your personal background, with particular reference to any activity in which you may have been engaged, touching on the problem of communism and its attempts to penetrate into the entertainment industry.

I suggest you may proceed in chronological order if it is agreeable to you.

Mr. BREWER. I was born in the State of Nebraska, Hall County, in 1909. I was raised in Nebraska and started early as an employee in the motion-picture theaters, which was my first association with the motion-picture industry.

I also became active in the labor movement and served for a time as president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor, 8 years, as a matter of fact. My work in labor ultimately took me into the national scene, where I became an appointed officer of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. This was in 1945.

On March 12 of 1945 I was assigned to a temporary assignment in Hollywood, Calif. That was the day that the first of the so-called Hollywood jurisdictional strikes broke out, and for a period of 8 years thereafter I remained as an officer, international representative in charge of the west coast office of the IATSE.

It was in this capacity that I came into contact with the problem of communism in Hollywood, and my contact came almost on the date of my arrival, and, I might add, is still going on.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you, in preliminary fashion, is there or has there been in Hollywood "blacklisting"?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I would say that blacklisting in the term of an illegal, improper, sinister activity, as has been applied, does not exist.

Mr. ARENS. Has it existed in general?

Mr. BREWER. No.

Mr. ARENS. What has been the practice and what is the practice, the employment practice, insofar as it bears upon the problem of Communist and pro-Communist penetration of the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Well, after the hearings in 1947—

Mr. ARENS. Do you mean the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the Hollywood Ten?

Mr. BREWER. Right.

After those hearings, the motion-picture industry, in what has come to be known as the Waldorf-Astoria Resolution, enunciated a policy to the effect that they would not hire known Communists in the motion-picture industry. This was the first basis of an industry position.

Since that time, I think that position has been changed somewhat. There is no overall policy that is rigidly adhered to by each of the companies but, by and large, as a result of the exposé of those hearings and subsequent hearings which disclosed a rather serious Communist penetration in the motion-picture industry, the industry took the position that those persons who had become publicly identified with Communist activities would not be employed unless and until they made it clear that such associations as they had with the Communists no longer existed.

Mr. ARENS. Is that in your phraseology within the frame of the reference you have in mind, "blacklisting"?

Mr. BREWER. No.

Mr. ARENS. In the course of your experience in the work which you have described, have you had occasion to formulate an opinion as to whether or not there have been any sweeping instances or general instances, significant instances, of blacklisting of innocent persons from employment on false charges of communism or Communist activity?

Mr. BREWER. I would say that, within the basic policy which I have enunciated, every effort has been made on the part of everyone connected with the industry to make it as easy as possible for those persons who had gotten involved innocently or unintentionally to make their position known and, as I say, there has been no person that I know of who wanted to make their position clear who was not only given a chance to, but aided in every way that they could do so, and, having done so, there was no further question about their employment.

Mr. ARENS. Have you, in the course of your career, been engaged as a "clearance" man?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I have been charged particularly in the report of the Fund for the Republic of having done so.

Mr. ARENS. Have you done so?

Mr. BREWER. No.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have a copy of the report before you?

Mr. BREWER. I do.

Mr. ARENS. I invite your attention, if you please, sir, to not only the references to yourself and to your activities, which appear scattered in various places throughout Volume I of the report, but to a concentration of reference to yourself beginning on pages 66 and 67.

I should like to have you, at your own pace and in your own way, allude to the references in this volume to yourself and make such statements as you feel obliged to make to this committee.

Mr. BREWER. This has to do with the 1945 Hollywood strikes, and of course it is impossible to intelligently understand the issues and the problems revolving out of the strike without understanding a great deal of the background that led up to the strikes, because these were very strange circumstances under which these strikes were called; very few people could understand them because they did not understand that, basically, the strikes of 1945 and 1946 were strikes called by persons who were involved in trade-union organizations that were identified in one way or another with the Communist Party position to win jurisdiction and power in the motion-picture industry, as against those unions that were resisting the Communist Party.

Mr. ARENS. What is this relation between the Communist penetration of your union and so-called blacklisting?

Mr. BREWER. The Communist movement in Hollywood was a single overall movement and the efforts of the Communists to get control of the unions was a part of their effort to get control of the motion-picture industry itself. It was the effort of the industry to shake off the control of the Communists that had reached a pretty substantial stage in 1945 that has brought about the charges of so called blacklisting.

Mr. ARENS. On page 15, Volume I of this report, there is a reference to "Salt of the Earth," a motion picture?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. A footnote here reads, among other things:

Roy M. Brewer, then international representative of the Theatrical Stage Employees' Union, and Chairman of the Hollywood A. F. of L. Film Council, offered the services of the council in helping to suppress the film. The distribution of Salt of the Earth was halted after motion-picture projectionists (members of Brewer's union), and theater owners across the country refused to show it.

Do you have any comments or suggestions to make?

Mr. BREWER. The term "offered the services of the council" is obviously the language of the person who prepared that report. It was no secret in Hollywood that the Hollywood AFL Film Council, myself, and most everyone who knew the circumstances, considered the picture Salt of the Earth as an effort made by persons who had been publicly identified for the most part as Communists to produce a picture that would prejudice the interests of the United States, particularly in the Latin American countries.

We felt that the making and the showing of this film was a part of the effort to discredit the position of the United States in the world struggle that was going on, and as such, we were against it. There was no secret about that.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Brewer, on page 17 Volume II of this report, reference is made to yourself and your union activities and reference is made to George E. Browne and a man by the name of Willie Bioff.

Without undertaking to read all the language, I would summarize the reference by saying that the paragraph here and the page points to the fact that Mr. Bioff and I believe also, yes, Mr. Browne, were sentenced to jail sentences?

Mr. BREWER. Right.

Mr. ARENS. Did you as an individual have any connection with either Mr. Browne or Mr. Bioff in any of the events which contributed to their jail sentences?

Mr. BREWER. I held no position as a national officer in this organization during the period when Mr. Browne or Mr. Bioff were in power. As a matter of fact, they were convicted in 1941 and my first official association with the national officers of the organization was in 1945.

I had seen Mr. Browne during the time when he was president merely as a member of the union, but Mr. Bioff I had never even met. The only time I saw him was from a distance at a convention in 1938. I had absolutely nothing to do with him, I had absolutely nothing to do with the so called administration of that group.

When I went with the IATSE as a national officer, I considered them and I consider now that their influence had been completely dissipated so far as the direction of the national organization was concerned.

Mr. ARENS. Were you ever interviewed by a representative of the Fund for the Republic in connection with the preparation of the report of that organization in blacklisting?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us in your own words what transpired in that interview.

Mr. BREWER. I was interviewed at quite great length by Mr. Paul Jacobs. He asked me a great many questions, which I answered as best I could. I tried to make him see that there really was no basis for the report whatsoever, in my judgment, and that I considered the efforts to write the report as an effort not to defend civil liberties as they said but, rather, to discredit those persons who had devoted themselves to the effort of preventing the Communist Party from taking control and domination of the motion-picture industry.

I tried to point out to him that with respect to the matter of clearance, that the only person that could clear an individual was that individual himself; that the vast majority of persons who got involved with the Communists were persons who either didn't understand what the Communist Party was or didn't understand that they were really involved with the Communist Party.

There was a great deal of confusion and this is the thing that the Communists thrived on.

First, they created confusion and then they generated hatred and bitterness, and that out of this had come a most chaotic situation for a long period of time, and that the only hope of cleaning up the situation and restoring it on some sort of basic standards which were acceptable to Americans was to eliminate and isolate the Communist Party influence.

Now, most of the persons, as I say, who found themselves involved, were not persons who basically sympathized with what the Communist Party was trying to do. As I say, they either didn't know that the Communists were there—some knew they were there but were deluded in the idea that they were not subversive—others thought that they might be a little subversive but they were not important; that the cause they purported to stand for was more important and so they went along.

So what I tried to make him see was that when these persons found themselves in disrepute as a result of disclosures which had taken place, what those of us who were working in Hollywood were trying to do were actually trying to help those persons who wanted to make their position clear to make it clear. But if a person didn't want to make their position clear, there was nothing anybody could do for them. They had made their record and it was up to them to clarify that record.

As I say, we were willing to help them, to try to make them see where they had made their mistake and how they could make their position clear, but so far as the clearance was concerned, those individuals that were cleared, cleared themselves by their actions and their statements and by convincing the American people basically that they

had no subversive intentions and that whatever associations they had with the Communist Party had been severed.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your background and experience, Mr. Brewer, are you in a position to appraise before this committee the phraseology which was used by the Communist Party itself to describe the efforts of the patriots to weed out the Communists from Hollywood? What phraseology did the Communists use?

Mr. BREWER. Against those persons, you mean?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. BREWER. Well, of course they used any phrase that they could to discredit them. If the people to whom they were trying to appeal were pro-labor, they would try to create the impression that they were anti-labor. If the people were interested in race relations, they would attempt to make them appear anti-Semitic or in favor of segregation.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Communists use the term "blacklisting" to apply to the efforts of patriotic people and organizations and the industry trying to rid themselves of Communist penetration?

Mr. BREWER. They have used the term "blacklisting," I think, in an effort to try to frighten the motion-picture industry as a whole from its efforts to eliminate Communist influences and Communist persons.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know whether or not the Communist Party to this day in its publications uses the term "blacklisting" to undertake to describe the efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the agencies of Government, or the patriotic organizations to weed out the Communists from the entertainment and other industries?

Mr. BREWER. I have rather concrete evidence of that in the Daily Worker of June 26, which has a headline "Uncover Trio as Blacklist High Court," and, incidentally, they brushed me off in this and they are giving Mr. Sokolsky and Mr. Victor Riesel and Fred Woltman the term "the high court."

The Fund seems to give me the credit but the Daily Worker doesn't seem to want to.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I have before me two Daily Workers of more recent date, namely, July 11 and July 12, in which the Daily Worker with great glee welcomes the report of the Fund for the Republic which we are discussing here today. It uses practically the same language in the Daily Workers as is used in the report of the Fund for the Republic, and follows the same line.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your background and experience, I should like to ask you if you are conversant with the report itself? Have you read that part of the report pertaining to the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I have.

Mr. ARENS. What is your appraisal of that report from the standpoint of an objective, factual, truthful appraisal of the situation within the industry?

Mr. BREWER. In the first place the report ignores the basic premise, the basic problem, that confronted the motion-picture industry and the basis of all the problems which the Fund purports to consider is the problem of Communist infiltration into the motion-picture industry which the Fund seems to feel is of no importance.

Based upon a reading of the report, you first get the conclusion that the evil is blacklisting, not communism. This is the first basis on which I sharply disagree with the report. I think that had the Fund been interested in the matter of civil rights that they would have attempted to evaluate the entire problem, not just an offshoot of the problem which blacklisting was or so-called blacklisting.

As I say, had anyone lived through the days when the Communists dominated the scene, as I did, and seen the way that persons' characters were destroyed overnight by a very effective program of character assassination—

Mr. ARENS. By whom?

Mr. BREWER. By the Communists. And it was a very effective effort that they did.

For example, they had a small secret group and they would take a grain of truth and they would distort this truth in such a way as to reflect, to exaggerate it, and enlarge it, and then they would start planting these stories all around the industry.

Now, the average person, when he went to work on one of the studio lots and he heard a makeup artist make reference to this fact, and I will give you a specific example of one of the stories that they spread during the height of the strike. They spread the story that Richard Walsh, president of the IATSE, was a brother-in-law of George Browne, the former president, which, of course, was not true. But they spread that story all over Hollywood and a great many people came to believe it.

Mr. ARENS. What difference would it make whether he had been the brother-in-law?

Mr. BREWER. Perhaps it wouldn't, but because of the fact that he was in great disrepute and they were attempting to prejudice the case—

Mr. ARENS. That was not guilt by association, was it?

Mr. BREWER. It could have been. I guess it might have been.

This was exactly what they were trying to do, because he was in disrepute. They were trying to establish the fact that his alleged relationship to Browne made him unreliable and therefore would cause them to take the position which they wanted the people to take, rather than the one Mr. Walsh wanted them to take.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Brewer, am I correct in my recollection that you attended some of the hearings of this committee on the west coast?

Mr. BREWER. I have attended most of the hearings of the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. That is where I first met you?

Mr. BREWER. From time to time since 1947.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you not present even as late as 1952 when there was volumes of testimony of so-called blacklisting by the Communists of non-Communists in the entertainment field?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; there definitely was.

Mr. SCHERER. You know that there is considerable testimony available in the records of this committee, sworn testimony; is there not?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; there is.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you now, does the report of the Fund for the Republic deal in any respect with that type of blacklisting?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; it does touch on that but, in typical fashion, it brushes this off in that it says:

Well, whatever there was was more or less informal and therefore not important—

whereas the actions of the industry were more formal and, therefore, more diabolical, or whatever word you want to use.

I think it's important also to know that the apparatus which existed in Hollywood was unbelievably effective in the way that they would destroy a person, and this is the way that they accomplished their blacklisting.

Mr. ARENS. Who is "they"?

Mr. BREWER. The Communist Party. They would have a secret meeting and they would agree upon a story that they were going to spread and, as I say, the next day that story would spring up on the sets, it would spring up in the shops and a person hearing it for the first time from a makeup artist or from some other person wouldn't think anything about it, but if he went down to the shop and heard the identical story in the shop, and then went into one of the offices and found it in exactly the same fashion from one of the girls in the office, they began to believe it. This is the way it worked and, as I say, this type of activity was rampant in the industry in 1945 and 1946.

Mr. SCHERER. As I say, there is sworn testimony in the records of this committee giving incidents of blacklisting by the Communists as you have just described, is there not?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, in the Fund for the Republic's report, it goes into great detail of giving and outlining individual cases of alleged blacklisting by industry and of these various individuals who were anti-Communist, does it not?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I have not read it, I have only scanned through it, but does the Fund report list in any detail or does it give specific instances, the names, of individuals who were blacklisted by the Communists?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; it does. It does give some reference to that. It names several persons and does discuss in some detail the efforts of the Communists to set up their own blacklist, and does admit that it was effective to some extent.

But, as I say, the summary of it and the conclusions were that it was of an informal nature and, therefore, appears not to be so important as what the industry had done.

Mr. ARENS. May I read you some language appearing on pages 166 and 167 of volume I of the Fund for the Republic?

So, though Brewer remained the top evaluator, Ward Bond, Borden Chase, and Martin Berkeley, all active members of MPA, were also called upon to sit in judgment.

The MPA, that is the Motion Picture Alliance.

That put them in the position of determining the "employability" of people who were competing for the same kind of jobs they themselves held.

What is your observation with respect to that statement?

Mr. BREWER. I want to say this: that there is absolutely no evidence that can be produced by anyone that any of the efforts on the part of any person with whom I was associated in any way was on a personal nature. As a matter of fact, the objective, we considered the enemy

to be the Communist apparatus and the minute that a person had indicated their disassociation with the Communist apparatus and that they were no longer serving the Communist apparatus, then everyone that I was connected with were ready and willing to assist them in any way possible.

Now, a very specific example of that was the case of Mr. Ward Bond, who is mentioned, and Mr. Jose Ferrer.

I think it was in about 1951 or thereabouts there was a very bitter exchange between Mr. Bond and Mr. Ferrer in the trade paper. It was front page of Daily Variety and there was a running quarrel going on for a long period of time, but in 1953, the early part of 1953, when Mr. Ferrer made it clear that he no longer had any desire to have any associations with these people, and also made it clear that those associations that he had had, had been by carelessness on his part or failure to analyze the entire situation, Mr. Ward Bond was one of the first ones to come to his defense.

So that there is absolutely no evidence that can be produced anywhere to substantiate the charge that any of the people with whom I was in any way associated used their position in this fight or what influence they had to injure anyone professionally. It was all the other way.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Brewer, what is your observation with respect to the Fund for the Republic report on identifying data?

Mr. BREWER. Would you be a little more specific as to just what you mean by that?

Mr. ARENS. Does this report objectively, in your judgment as a professional in this field of fighting Communists, does it supply sufficient identifying data as the basis for its conclusions?

Mr. BREWER. The conclusions of the report, as I say, are running through it, all through it, and one of the rather significant things I think that I noticed about the report is that in summarizing the position of the anti-Communists, they use the language of the writer.

In other words, my position is not what I said it was but what the writer concluded that it was, whereas, in the case of Mr. Sorrell, in one particular instance they quote him verbatim quite at length.

So that in every instance where they are presenting the position of the anti-Communist, that position is stated on the basis of what they found the position to be rather than what it is. I won't say that this is the case in every instance but there are many instances of it and there are also instances of where there have been additions made that are not based upon fact also.

So, as I say, there is some material to substantiate it.

I noticed that in describing the strike situation, they go in quite detail quoting bulletins and so forth, but there are very, very many instances of where they have just drawn a conclusion and left it at that without any real statement of facts as they existed, which would permit a reader to draw his own conclusions.

Mr. ARENS. Are there any other items of information which you would like to supply the committee with reference to the subject matter?

Mr. BREWER. There are a number of points that I think ought to be called.

Mr. ARENS. Then at your own pace make those points.

Mr. BREWER. For example, in discussing the question of labor in Hollywood, they make quite an effort to make it appear that these events were all leading up to a situation where I would become the dominant person in Hollywood. They fail completely to evaluate the position of a man by the name of Jeff Kibre in the development of the trade-union problem in Hollywood.

There is a great deal of data available regarding Mr. Kibre and the part that he played and this report brushes that over completely. Mr. Kibre has been identified as a Communist in a number of instances.

There is available a series of public reports which he made in 1939 to known Communist officials and it was, as a matter of fact, the exposé of Mr. Kibre's associations that caused their first effort in 1939 to fail and then the report goes on to set up the existence of the Conference of Studio Unions, the development of the Conference of Studio Unions, despite the fact that the president of the Conference of Studio Unions, Herbert Sorrell, has been identified I think by three different persons in sworn public testimony that he was a Communist.

A copy of his Communist Party membership receipts was presented before a congressional committee in 1948, and the FBI issued a report that the signature on there was his handwriting; all of these things have been brushed off and the report in such a way as to create a doubt in the mind of the reader as to whether or not the efforts of the Conference of Studio Unions was really a Communist effort, when I think that any real student who is as proficient as the investigators for the Fund professed to be would know that this was very definitely a Communist effort continuing from 1934 on until 1947 or 1948 when it was finally disposed of.

But, as I say, through the entire description of this background, despite the existence of very valuable and important material, as I say, including a verbatim report from Kibre to Mr. Roy Hudson in New York as to what their program was for Hollywood, which was published and is available, this was completely ignored.

Now, another factor that is erroneous in the report is the implication that the Motion Picture Alliance was antilabor. As a matter of fact, the report says specifically that when I joined the Motion Picture Alliance I jeopardized my reputation as a labor leader because the Motion Picture Alliance was supposed to be an antilabor organization.

Well, as a matter of fact, at the time I joined the Motion Picture Alliance, the president was a labor man. The president was Mr. Walter Redmond, who was then the vice president of the plasterers international union, who later became the secretary-treasurer of the plasterers union, and from its inception the Motion Picture Alliance had the support of the anti-Communist labor groups, including the teamsters, under the able leadership first of Mr. Joe Touhy and later under the leadership of Mr. Ralph Clair and the plasterers union under the leadership of Mr. Redmond, as I pointed out, and Mr. Bennie Martinez, who is still a member of the board and who is now a vice president of the plasterers union.

There were a substantial number of labor members in the Motion Picture Alliance from its inception. So that the implication that it was antilabor is not true and it should be corrected.

Now, there are any number of smaller incidents which are only incidentally important.

For example, in describing the question of the trial of Mr. Sorrell before the Central Labor Council in Los Angeles, the report makes the statement that the affiliations of the attorneys for the Conference of Studio Unions were questioned.

Well, as a matter of fact, the attorneys for the Conference of Studio Unions were the firm of Pestana and Esterman, and both of these individuals have been identified in public testimony as having been members of the Communist Party.

One of the other firms that represented the Conference of Studio Unions was the firm of Katz, Gallagher and Margolis, and this firm has been pretty well established as having some associations with the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. That is an understatement.

Mr. BREWER. And despite the fact that when they describe the IATSE, they never fail to inject into the report the fact that this was the union of the notorious Browne and Bioff, and they failed in instance after instance to set forth the facts with respect to these matters.

In other words, they say that the affiliations were questioned so as to raise a doubt as to whether they were questioned properly or not, but as I say, in the case of our situation, it was a positive statement that this was the notorious situation. So that this is the tenor in which the entire report is written.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Brewer, do you know Elizabeth Poe, one of the contributors to the report?

Mr. BREWER. I know who she is.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any information respecting her activity?

Mr. BREWER. What I know about Elizabeth Poe primarily is that she wrote an attack on me in a magazine called *Frontier*, which is edited by her husband, a magazine that is published as a so-called liberal paper on the west coast but which, so far as I am concerned, is a completely Communist Party line publication.

Mr. ARENS. Was that attack prior to the time that Miss Poe worked on the Fund for the Republic report?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. I might say that in this report she did not distinguish at all between Communists and innocents or fellow travelers or anything else. She took the position that my efforts against the Communists were just as reprehensible as my efforts against anyone else. She did not, as I say, draw any line between them. She felt that any effort on the part of anyone to prevent Communists from working in the motion-picture industry was wrong.

Mr. SCHERER. A little bit of that philosophy is carried over into the report?

Mr. BREWER. A great deal of it, but not quite so much.

Mr. SCHERER. I said a little bit.

Mr. BREWER. There are a couple of points that I wanted to make. For example, there is a reference in the report on page 70, volume I, to the strike situation, in which it says, I think, in exact quotes:

Roy Brewer attended most of the producers' meetings.

Now this is a complete falsification. The producers met hundreds and hundreds of times, and during the crucial stage of this strike,

when the Conference of Studio Unions was calling a strike in these studios to try to force the producers to allocate work, and this was the only issue, to allocate work favorable to their union and disfavorable to ourselves. There were some meetings which I attended, but to say that I attended most of the producers' meetings is a complete distortion of fact.

My relationship with the producers was just as it should be. I was the head of an organization which was involved in this situation with them. There were certain mutual areas of interest and I met with them to discuss them, and that is all. This is a distortion.

Now there is another situation with respect to the famous Zsa Zsa Gabor incident which I want to point out.

Mr. ARENS. First of all, for the purpose of this record and the enlightenment of the committee, tell us who is Zsa Zsa Gabor.

Mr. BREWER. Zsa Zsa Gabor? She is a motion-picture actress.

On page 158, volume I, he describes this incident to prove that my influence has become worldwide in this situation, and he says, and the incident took place, oh, she was offered a part in a picture to be made in France. Some American in France had cautioned her about this because they had heard that the director of this picture had been identified as a Communist and was what was termed in the parlance of the industry as a refugee from the committee.

He had to go to France, apparently, to avoid the service of a subpoena.

Mr. SCHERER. There were a number of those.

Mr. BREWER. There was some question in their minds about whether or not this was a fact, and this person told her that if she wanted to find out for sure she should call me in Hollywood, which she did.

I merely advised her that it was true; that he had been identified. It was true also that it has been the policy of the committee to subpoena persons who had so been identified, but that he had not been in this country so that he could be subpoenaed. The quote says:

I made it clear I wasn't telling her whether she should go into the picture or not, Brewer said, but I did answer her question—

which is the fact. Now the report goes on:

The next day Brewer got a wire from Irving Brown, European AFL representative, asking again about Dassin's politics. Brewer made his objections stronger and Dassin was dropped.

This is untrue. As a matter of fact, I had received prior to her call the same inquiry, to which I gave the same answer that I did to Mr. Brown, which was to do nothing except to tell them the truth. This is a distortion in the report, which I resent and which I think is wrong.

Now with respect to the whole matter of this effort to make me the supreme satanic majesty in this evil operation that was taking place in Hollywood, I want to say that I became interested in the Communist problem as a result of my determination not to let the Communists run the union which I represented out of the motion-picture industry. It had been a part of the motion-picture industry since its inception and it was obvious to me that the Communists had determined that they would never be able to control that union, and, therefore, they were bound to destroy it.

I recognized that you cannot fight the symptoms of a disease. You have to fight the cause, and the cause of it was the hard core of the Communist Party which was operating in 2 groups, 1 in the trade unions and 1 in the creative crafts, and that whenever it served their purpose they joined together for the purpose of destroying their mutual enemies, and I happened to be on their list of mutual enemies.

So that I realized that, first of all, you could not defeat them in the trade unions if they continued to flourish in the creative fields, and therefore I recognized it as one fight and I tried to associate myself with the people who felt like I did, that they were a menace to the industry; they were a menace to the country, they were a menace to the freedom for which our country stands.

I did not want, I did not seek, I do not want now, any power over anyone. As I said, any influence that I had came from the fact that I was willing to work at the job of countering the influence of what I consider to be a very evil force.

Secondly, that I was willing to spend my time to help those persons who had been innocently involved and who had been tricked into going along with something which was sinister and which they really had no intention and desire of being a part of. This was the sole basis of my interest and, as I say, I did not want power, I do not want it now, and this is a complete distortion of my interest and my influence and my efforts in the matter.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Brewer, we thank you for your testimony.

That would conclude the staff interrogation of this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No; only, Mr. Brewer, I know of the work you have done, particularly on the west coast, and you have rendered a valuable service not only to the industry and the union which you represent, but I believe to this country.

Mr. BREWER. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. Do not feel badly about the position in which the report of the Fund for the Republic places you.

Mr. BREWER. Congressman, I don't.

Mr. SCHERER. Because whenever you join an anti-Communist crusade, whether in the Legion or a group such as you are identified with or this committee, you can expect, as you know, the type of attack that you have faced.

Mr. BREWER. I don't worry about it.

Mr. DOYLE. May I be privileged to say, Mr. Brewer, that it is a pleasure for me to appear on this committee today and have you appear before it?

I remember with pleasure my frequent contacts with you on the west coast and the very important and fine work you did out there. We miss you out there.

Mr. BREWER. Thank you. I miss being there, too.

Mr. DOYLE. I do wish to ask a very few questions.

Mr. BREWER. Surely.

Mr. DOYLE. Not, however, on the subject of the report, but I feel I would like to take advantage of your expert knowledge in the field

of communism and subversive activities as long as you are here to submit to a couple of questions.

Mr. BREWER. I would be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. DOYLE. If you have an opinion based on your experience and knowledge in the field of entertainment in Hollywood, primarily, first, what is your opinion as to the present condition of the Communist infiltration of Hollywood entertainment?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I think that, so far as the present situation is concerned, that the line of communication between the hard core of the Communist Party and the persons who used to do the bulk of their work for them has been effectively severed. While there are some remnants of the period during which they substantially influenced the minds of the creative people of the industry, I do think that the situation is improving daily, and I think that, by and large, it is in reasonably good shape and I think that a very effective job has been done there to break off that influence with a minimum amount of injury to the persons who were their victims.

Mr. DOYLE. To be more specific, I think we have testimony that the Communist influence still continues quite substantial in Hollywood, and I am wondering if that is your opinion.

Mr. BREWER. My opinion, as I said, was that, so far as I know, there is no effective effort being carried on by the party in the sense that they are able to use the industry or that they are able to influence substantially the people who make up the bulk of the industry.

I think that the influence is pretty substantially reduced. I think it is at a minimum.

Mr. DOYLE. In addition, let me ask you this, bearing in mind your statement:

Would you say that there are still active leaders in the Communist Party, who are still active in Hollywood, affecting the activity of the subversive influence in Hollywood?

Mr. BREWER. I know of none and I would say that the persons who were the spearhead of influencing the Communist authority are persona non grata with practically the entire makeup of the industry today. Now there may be persons who have gone back in from other areas that we have not been able to identify.

We know that persons who are identified Communists are still working in the New York theater and we know that there is in intercourse between them, and there may be some influence through that end but, as I say, so far as being able to pinpoint any persons who appear to be a part of the Communist apparatus as we used to know it, I know of none today.

But I must point out to you that I have been away for a year.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you speaking of Hollywood or New York?

Mr. BREWER. Hollywood.

Mr. SCHERER. You are not talking about New York?

Mr. BREWER. I am not talking about New York. There is no doubt but what there is a substantial infiltration in New York.

Mr. SCHERER. Particularly in the lower echelons?

Mr. BREWER. Not only on the lower echelons, there are Broadway producers who are identified members of the party, there are many members of casts on Broadway shows where the record of this committee shows they have been identified as party members, and they

are playing in Broadway plays in New York City, and these are not second-rate plays, they are the top ones.

Mr. SCHERER. You were talking in regard to Hollywood in response to Mr. Doyle's question and not necessarily the radio and television?

Mr. BREWER. I was talking only of Hollywood.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, do I understand then that even though your statement is that there is substantial Communist membership or activity in the entertainment field in New York, that that does not extend by connections to Hollywood?

I have always understood from you and others in years past that there was a pretty definite chain of activity between Communists in one part of the country and Communists in the other.

Do I understand that Hollywood now is free from that connection with New York?

Mr. BREWER. Well, due to the position of the industry and its awareness of this problem, the Communists are finding it very hard to maneuver in Hollywood today. As I say, the type of maneuvering and the type of influence which gives them influence and effectiveness has been pretty substantially curtailed in the Hollywood area, and it is the type of thing which the Fund report is complaining about that has made it impossible for them.

For example, there have been no motion-picture people of any consequence in any fronts of any consequence of any kind in the last 2 years, that I know of. The most recent situation was in respect to the musicians union.

Now the disclosures there did indicate that there was some activity within the musicians union but, as I say, I was not there during that time and I am not fully familiar with it, but the apparatus that used to function and that used to get Hollywood to do the work that they wanted to do behind the positions that they wanted to take, to generally create an atmosphere that was favorable to their operation, has been pretty well dissipated.

I think the fact that they have been able to get very little, if any, support for the Fund report is indicative of that fact. There have been no guilds rising up in Hollywood proclaiming the injustice of blacklisting in the motion-picture industry. There have been no guilds coming to the defense of the Fund for the Republic and saying that this is a great and noble project which they have instituted here in preserving the rights of freedom.

Mr. SCHERER. But the Daily Worker has?

Mr. BREWER. The Daily Worker has, but the point is that they can no longer get the people they used to get to do this job for them.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this on the question of rehabilitation, because the other witnesses have all spoken of that, and just briefly you have mentioned it.

To what extent do you feel that your efforts have resulted in rehabilitation, which I think has been designated in your testimony, and that of others as "clearance"? I am only using that because I have not read the report of the Fund for the Republic, but it is a word that has been used and I am interested in the question of rehabilitation.

Apparently the report refers to you in that connection. In what way have you rehabilitated? How many people, how many Com-

munists or former Communists would you say have been rehabilitated in the sense that they are now back in the industry because they cleared themselves?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I would say that there must be a hundred at least, and some of the most important names in the industry today are in that group.

The first man, whose name is well known to this committee, whom we helped to reestablish in the industry was Edward Dmytryk. As you know, Dmytryk was one of the original 10 and was cited and convicted and served a term for contempt of this committee.

A strange thing came out in the subsequent study of Edward Dmytryk's case, which was that he was actually not a member of the Communist Party at the time he was taking this position; that he had actually resigned from the party and that he had been influenced, and in some instances tricked, into taking a position before this committee which led to his citation for contempt.

Now I say that Edward Dmytryk today has been reestablished. He is a top director; he is directing one of the most important pictures in production in Hollywood today, which reputedly has one of the largest budgets in history. He is recognized as a great creative artist. He is accepted by the industry, and the industry for the most part has forgotten the episode, and I have every confidence that Edward Dmytryk has never believed in the Communist movement but he was tricked and deceived into becoming a part of it, because he was at heart a humanitarian and thought during this period that he was helping a humanitarian cause.

Mr. DOYLE. He was identified as a member of the Communist Party before this committee.

Mr. BREWER. He was. He was one of the original 10. There are many others.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your thought about the activities, the extent to which the Communist members in New York are underground, or what we would say are getting smart? Are they concealing their membership? Are they joining?

The reason I ask you that, to be perfectly frank with you, a witness this morning said that in New York they are getting smart. By that term I know you will know what it means.

Mr. BREWER. I would agree with that, that they are. Persons who have appeared in certain activities which certainly indicate that they are oriented in the Communist position, have no open records at all.

Mr. DOYLE. How can this committee and other similar governmental bodies uncover the fact that they are under Communist discipline, even though they may not be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BREWER. My belief is that if the opposition to them is intelligent, that they will have to expose themselves or they lose their usefulness in the work which they really want them to do. It's not the best way, but I think it's the only way.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to take advantage, I have not discussed this with you, but I want to take advantage of your presence here. I know that you know the history of this committee over a term of years.

Will you give us out of your experience over a term of years your appraisal in general terms at least of the extent of the usefulness of this committee, say, in this field of exposing and defeating, meeting

the problem of subversive activities in the field of entertainment, either in Hollywood or any place that you have in mind?

I do not know what your answer is going to be, but you have appeared here as an expert and I would like to have your opinion as an expert.

Mr. BREWER. Well, I have appeared before this committee at various times since 1947 and as the knowledge of the Communist conspiracy grew, I think that this committee has done a very effective work.

First of all, let me say that it was the hearings of 1947 that first alerted the American people to the danger of the Communist penetration of the entertainment field, and particularly the Hollywood motion-picture industry. Up until that time, I think that the average American thought that all the charges of communism were so much hogwash; that it was just the imagination of persons who were politically opposed to certain activities and were using this, to use an expression, a red herring.

But the exposures before this committee in 1947 here in Washington I think alerted the people that there was a real danger. Then, of course, subsequent hearings have made it possible, I think, to focus the activity on the real culprit in the case, and this was always the charge, and, of course, this is the way the Communists played it, which was to get us fighting amongst ourselves while they went off scot-free.

But I think the careful efforts of this committee over a long period of time, and as I say, as the knowledge of the Communist movement grew their techniques improved, and I think they have done a very effective work and certainly I have been a champion of what the committee has done and have defended it and would do so today.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Unless you have something, Counsel, the witness is excused with the thanks of the committee.

Mr. BREWER. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Call your next witness.

Mr. ARENS. Paul R. Milton.

Kindly remain standing, Mr. Milton, while the chairman administers the oath to you.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MILTON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL R. MILTON

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. MILTON. My name is Paul R. Milton. I live in New York City and have been a radio writer since 1942.

I had my first brush with what I think was the Communist Party in 1936. I was then editing a small magazine concerned with part of the theatrical industry and including the schools.

At that time the city of New York proposed a license measure to license all professional schools from chiropodists through teachers of

art, music, and dancing. The teachers of the arts got together and didn't want to be classified with certain other groups they didn't regard on their same cultural level, we will say, with no disrespect to chiropodists, and felt that a license measure of that kind would not serve any useful purposes.

So some 25 organizations came together, including one representing a group in the theater project, an unofficial one, at that time widely regarded as a Communist-dominated group. That one group insisted that the objections to the license measure that were going to be presented to the mayor be couched in its way and in its language and in no other terms would go along.

I have often admired the commonsense of those groups who were not political sophisticates but who listened to this man for a while and then said, "We are sorry. We have compromised and you won't. The only thing you can do is withdraw."

That taught me something about Communists. The name of that lawyer was Martin Popper, not then very well known but since known as the sponsor of the Peace Conference, an eminent lawyer of the Lawyers Guild and the International Juridical Association, and so on.

So their suspicions were well founded.

My next contact with what I regard the Communist Party came with the Radio Writers Guild, beginning in 1950 and lasting through 1952. In that connection I had occasion to testify as an anti-Communist witness.

Mr. DOYLE. Because of the signals indicating there may be a roll-call on the report of a bill before the House of Representatives, the committee will stand in recess for at least 15 minutes.

Members of the committee will respond and then return.

(Committee members present: Representatives Doyle, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(A short recess was taken.)

(Representative Doyle returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Because of the necessity for the committee members to be on the floor of the House for the rest of the afternoon, this committee will stand in recess until tomorrow morning. The hearing will be held tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in 1301, New House Office Building.

(Whereupon, at 5 p. m. Thursday, July 12, the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Friday, July 13, in room 1301, New House Office Building.)

INVESTIGATION OF SO-CALLED "BLACKLISTING" IN ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY—REPORT OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.—PART 2

FRIDAY, JULY 13, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.
PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities convened, pursuant to recess, at 10 a. m., in room 1301 of the House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, Clyde Doyle, of California, Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana, Harold H. Velde, of Illinois, Bernard W. Kearney, of New York, Donald L. Jackson, of California, and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Richard Arens, director; and K. Baarslag. The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Who is your first witness, Mr. Arens?

Mr. ARENS. The witness who presently occupies the witness chair was in the process of testifying yesterday afternoon, and he has already been sworn. The gentleman is Paul R. Milton.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL R. MILTON—Resumed

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Milton, when the committee recessed yesterday, you were in the process of giving us a little of your own personal background. Do you have other material that you wish to add with reference to your own personal background before we get into the general subject matter?

Mr. MILTON. I would simply finish what I think I was saying, that in 1951, I was an anti-Communist witness in front of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in connection with the Communist issue in the Radio Writers Guild, which is now defunct. Thereafter, I have been concerned with the foundation of AWARE, Inc., an anti-Communist organization in the entertainment-communications field, and I am a member of the board of directors of it, and I am the chairman of its information committee. I am here today in that capacity.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Milton, are you personally referred to in the report of the Fund for the Republic on so-called "blacklisting"?

Mr. MILTON. I am several times, sir, and the references to me personally in connection with the Radio Writers Guild controversy and

elsewhere I would say are both fair and accurate. But I cannot say the same about two anti-Communist groups I have been connected with, the Anti-Communist Caucus, and Radio Writers Guild, which was called We the Undersigned, and there are several misrepresentations of it in the report, and in connection with AWARE, Inc.

Mr. ARENS. Are you appearing today on behalf of AWARE, Inc., or representing AWARE, Inc.?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have a prepared statement which you would like to submit for the record on behalf or for AWARE, Inc.?

Mr. MILTON. I do, sir, and it deals with factual misrepresentations, what I consider significant omissions of fact, and particular with reference to AWARE and several of the controversies it has been in since 1953 when it was formed and made up.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Milton, I see that your statement is rather lengthy and I am going to suggest to the chairman that the statement itself be incorporated in the body of the record and that you now proceed to summarize the essence of the statement orally for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be so incorporated.

I am just wondering whether the statement will be sufficient for the purpose of the report. We will determine that later.

(The statement referred to above appears on pp. 5344-5353.)

Mr. ARENS. What are the main observations by AWARE on the report?

Mr. MILTON. They come down to three, sir. One is the overall murkiness of language.

Mr. DOYLE. May I have that answer again?

Mr. MILTON. The overall murkiness of language, the cloudy use of undefined terms.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt? I think that I best described it the moment I read the report by calling it gobbledegook. Is not that a pretty good technical description of it?

Mr. MILTON. That is somewhat an insult to gobbledegook, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would say it is an understatement?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MILTON. To give specifics in support of that observation, it uses the terms, "rightwing" and "leftwing" throughout the report and I am speaking specifically of volume II of the report dealing with radio and television in the East. "Rightwing" and "leftwing" are used again and again without any definitions as to what they may mean. The word "liberal" is likewise used without any definition. Some 40 times the word "political" is used as a substitute for or euphemism for communism.

That is, for instance, it talks again and again about "political screening." The report uses that term in connection with AWARE. We do not screen or suggest screening anybody with a purpose of finding out whether they belong to Republican or Democratic or Liberal or Farmer-Labor Party or any legitimate political organization. AWARE believes, and agrees with the President of the United States and the Supreme Court and every other official body of the Government, and with Communist writings that the Communist Party is a

conspiracy, and has nothing whatsoever to do with ordinary politics as the American people understand the material.

So to use "political," instead of "Communist" in this report throws a cloud of vagueness over every passage in which it is used. It must be misleading to any reader who is uninitiated in the jargon of the Communist Party, and uninitiated in the anatomy of the controversy as it has been on for several years in the entertainment-communications field.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you go along with the theory of the majority of the American people that this is not a political party, but it is a Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MILTON. We do, indeed, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Hiding under the name of a political party?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir. There is no question about it, in our minds, that it is a conspiratorial effort which is composed in part of, deliberate and knowing conspirators, and in part, of people who go along with it without realizing that they are giving it assistance.

Mr. ARENS. What is the position of AWARE, Mr. Milton, with reference to so-called clearances dealt with in the Fund's report?

Mr. MILTON. We would not agree with the report at all, that any such efforts have been sinister. On the contrary, as Mr. Brewer testified yesterday, the voluntary efforts of people in the entertainment-communications field to help Communists, ex-Communists, and Communist fronters and ex-Communist fronters to "rehabilitate" themselves as the word has been used—those efforts are admirable. Many allegations are made that money has been paid. The report alleges in several cases that so-called clearance men have hired themselves out to write speeches for people trying to rehabilitate themselves or in some other way unspecified in the report, requesting money out of the desire of people to reestablish themselves as employable citizens.

If the report can name any names in that connection, it should have done so. It alleges vaguely in many places, hints at possibilities of extortion in such situations. If the Fund for the Republic and the report know of any instances of such extortion, they should have gone to the district attorney of whatever county they think the events took place, and AWARE, for one, would join in any effort to expose such incidents if they happened.

It is AWARE's conviction that if any such events like that did take place, they were so few as to be the criminal exception rather than the decent normal nature of events.

Mr. ARENS. What is the position of AWARE with reference to this term "blacklisting" which is used throughout the report?

Mr. MILTON. The report gives one definition of "blacklisting," which I shall try to paraphrase: "Simply the denial of employment to people deemed worthy of censure or condemnation." In that sense, we know that blacklisting is practiced very widely. The Federal Housing Administration, for instance, issues occasional lists of builders deemed to have gyped homeowners and blacklists them. They are not to be dealt with by persons obtaining FHA loans. The Water Front Commission of New York City by State law blacklists men from working on the waterfront who have criminal records. Every union blacklists employers who are deemed to have treated their members unfairly, such as not paying wages, not meeting con-

ditions of collective bargaining agreements, and so on. The question is, if anybody is blacklisted in that sense, are they or are they not worthy of condemnation and censure?

AWARE believes that a Communist, a fifth-amendment witness, and persons with significant and unrepudiated records of association with Communist-front organizations should not be employed for a variety of reasons which I will state in a moment. But, I would say that the judgment of whether or not they should be employed should rest with the individual employer. The Government may clear employees for itself. Each individual employer should make up his own mind on the basis of what information he may have or obtain and seek such advice as he feels necessary as he may do in a legal matter, in an accounting matter, or in a tax matter.

He will stand on his own judgment and take the praise or blame as it may eventuate. Now, the reasons why Communists and fifth-amendment witnesses and persistent fronters should not be employed in entertainment-communications are fairly obvious to us, but not obvious in the report, for instance.

On the premise that communism is a conspiracy, we know that there are Communist caucuses in several of the unions, and this committee has stated its belief and its conviction that there is such in the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists, and we know there was one in the Radio Writers Guild.

Mr. ARENS. How about Actors' Equity Association?

Mr. MILTON. And of Actors' Equity Association. I might comment parenthetically, sir, that this morning the Associated Press apropos of yesterday's testimony by Mr. Hartnett, quotes an official of Equity, as follows:

Over a period of 30 years allegations of this kind have been advanced with varying degrees of responsibility. Every member of Actors' Equity Association who has been identified in any way in this connection has denied under oath that he is a Communist, and no evidence has been presented whether those charges are true.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is not exactly so.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is not so.

Mr. MILTON. I was coming to that, sir. To link this to the report, it is a comment on testimony about the report, but it is a kind of misinformation that does nothing whatsoever to clarify the issue of blacklisting.

Mr. ARENS. What are the facts on Actors' Equity?

Mr. MILTON. Without even going to the records, we can say that in Actors' Equity Association a number of persons have been charged with Communist Party membership before this or some other committee, and have taken the 5th, 1st, and 10th amendments or none whatsoever, and from just a casual reference we know there is Lionel Stander, Gale Sondergaard—who is to appear next week in Philadelphia and there has been a big public storm there over her appearance in a tax-supported theater. There is Morris Carnovsky, John Randolph, George Tyne, Jack Gilford, Lou Polan, Elliott Sullivan, Stanley Prager, and there are as many more again who do not come to my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is significant to note that each of those people were confronted with sworn testimony of witnesses who said that they were members of the Communist Party, and instead of deny-

ing the accusations hid—and I use the word "hid" advisedly—behind the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir, and I believe there was one exception who took no refuge in no amendment and who just flatly refused to answer, and I believe that was Lou Polan. But the point is, it does not square at all with the statement from Actor's Equity. Certainly the Equity statement does nothing to clarify the situation with respect to Communists in unions.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question there? Do I understand the individuals whom you have named and who have appeared and taken recourse in the provisions of the Constitution, with the exception of the one noted, are presently members in good standing of Equity?

Mr. MILTON. We were speaking, I think, of blacklisting and why AWARE, for one, believes that such persons are rendering themselves unemployable. Reason No. 2 is that wages paid to Communists go in part to the Communist Party, that the use of their names by Communist Party groups and by Communist action groups and fronts, acts to aid those organizations in persuading the public that they are respectable. We know that actors, personalities, and important producers, directors and writers—their opinions carry a good deal of weight with the public. Furthermore, we know from union elections that prominent actors are always more famous within their unions than actors who are not prominent.

In other words, continual and preferred employment to such persons give them prestige not only in public view but inside the industry.

Therefore, we regard such persons as worthy of condemnation and censure, pursuing the definition, the one definition of blacklisting given by the report. We know of no instance in which a person has been blacklisted in the industry for union activity as blacklisting is defined in the Federal and various State labor laws.

Mr. ARENS. Has anyone, to your knowledge, been precluded from employment in the entertainment industry because of his political beliefs or political associations?

Mr. MILTON. No, sir. I know specifically of no one denied employment because he is a Republican, Democrat, Socialist, Liberal, Farmer-Labor, or any other name of a legitimate political organization. But I do know of people as they claim denied employment because they are associated with the Communist conspiracy.

There are other definitions of blacklisting and when we get into those we find that the Fund, frequently without a proper definition of it, beyond that one, leads us into a swamp of murkiness.

The way to end it, and to end both blacklisting by whatever term you may wish to call it, is not to destroy the careers of individuals, and that is not AWARE's purpose, and we do not think that that should be the direct purpose of any organization, public or private, concerned with the Communist issue. The way to end the Communist menace is for those persons to change by honest conviction within themselves.

For that reason, last year after this committee's hearings in New York, the president of AWARE, Mr. Godfrey Schmidt, appealed over television to the 22 recalcitrant witnesses of last August to return before the committee and tell the truth. We would reiterate that appeal, that they return before this committee at the earliest moment and rehabilitate themselves by an action growing out of their own

convictions that what they have been doing is wrong, morally wrong, and wrong from the point of view of national security, bad for their own careers, and bad for their unions and bad for the industry that they claim to love.

We think, further, that were this committee to direct an inquiry precisely at what the Fund calls blacklisting, not very clearly, and at the entire process of job denial for Communist affiliation, they would provide an opportunity to all people who believe they have been blacklisted to come before this committee and tell the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. You might be interested in knowing that we will presently call some of the people this report charges have been blacklisted, and ask them where and when they have been blacklisted.

Mr. MILTON. I am delighted to hear it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think subpoenas are out for some of them now.

Mr. MILTON. We would hope, and AWARE would hope, that that inquiry would include not only persons who have been named in sworn testimony as Communists, and not only those who have appeared before the committee and taken a constitutional immunity, but also those with substantial and significant front records.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your extensive background and experience in fighting the Communist penetration in the entertainment industry, and your keen observations of this subject matter, I would like to ask you now whether or not in your judgment as a representative of the great organization, AWARE, you and your organization feel that the Committee on Un-American Activities presently engages in book burning, in censorship, or in thought control in going into this subject of so-called blacklisting?

Mr. MILTON. I think certainly not. This committee provides a wonderful forum in which people may explain themselves. There is no form of pressure that I am aware of. Thought control of which the committee has been accused, is a Communist jargon term intended to discredit any expression of opinion about communism. The same goes for calling it censorship. It is not an attempt at censorship to investigate the origins or the nature of any element in a controversy over communism.

AWARE believes and urges and hopes and does everything it can to increase the amount of public discussion of the issue before governmental committees, and there is no better forum for this issue, because while a private organization may produce such evidence and such views as will throw light where there ought to be light, it remains that it cannot by nature be as convincing as that which is done under oath before the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very significant to note that the work of this committee, of course, is under the close observation of the entire Congress of the United States. In the last action taken on the appropriation bill for this committee, there was one vote against it. The year before there were no votes against it. So those persons who make the charges that they do, are overlooking the fact that a pretty tough board of censors has been covering the work of this committee.

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir, we have noted that many times, with great gratification.

Mr. JACKSON. I hope that remark does not appear in print that the opposition in Congress to the committee is increasing 100 percent year by year.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Milton, do you have any observations to make with reference to that part of the report which is the study appearing in volume II by Dr. Marie Jahoda?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir, Mr. Arens, I have, and in general nature they parallel the comments in our prepared statement which bear on the Cogley part of the report, to wit, the use of the faceless informer, the unidentified contributor, and of course, we all know what the faceless informer is and they may too, in the Fund for the Republic, and yet as our statement shows, 10 percent of the book is devoted to faceless informers.

Now, specifically in the Jahoda part of the report, page 240, a TV actor on a top level, not otherwise identified, is quoted as saying, "If you pay, you can get cleared." An unidentified speaker and behind the cover of anonymity makes a charge which sounds like extortion. I think in that case the Fund should have gone, or that actor should certainly have gone to the district attorney and made it clear what he means by paying for clearance, and whom he paid, and when and how much, and what was the result.

I think it is apropos to ask whether or not the report investigated the truth of that statement before it printed it. That raises a question which comes up again and again in the report as to whether or not a researcher has a responsibility as to quoting from ignorance. Again and again persons are quoted, obviously who do not know what they are talking about.

That does not seem to us to be scholarly research by any standard to pick up off-the-cuff remarks from unidentified persons which are slurs on otherwise decent citizens and put them down on paper and print them and disseminate them as if they were to be taken seriously. There is a question of simply scholarly responsibility. We can see how bad a job this report is, as a piece of scholarly research if you compare it with just any good research work on communism that you can find in any library on communism.

Two come to mind. One is *A Century of Conflict*, by Stefan Possony, and another example is *Communism Versus the Negro*, by William A. Nolan. Those are good research jobs and there are many like it, and unfortunately, the Fund report cannot be put on the same bookshelf with those.

Now, further, with reference to the Jahoda study, she says on page 248, volume II, quoting one man, and not otherwise identified:

Many were thus labelled—

meaning as Communists—

even though they had been cleared by the FBI.

Here, again, it was quoting from ignorance. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has said over and over and over again on television and during the Harry Dexter White controversy that the FBI does not have the power to clear anybody, not even for the Government.

It provides the information for other persons to evaluate. Why quote this kind of nonsense, then? On page 251, Miss Jahoda quotes in the first paragraph:

They—

referring to the persons that they interviewed—

were all aware of the watertight system of control over content before it goes on the air, which excludes possibilities of direct subversion.

That same statement appears also in the earlier portion of the report. What it tries to say is that it is impossible for subversive material or slander material to get on the air, because every network and every script editor and every broadcasting employer reads and edits scripts very carefully. It is true they do. I have been writing radio since 1942, and I have dealt with these script editors of virtually all of the networks and with many other employees in broadcasting.

I have a lot of respect for their knowledge and their ability and their conscientiousness and their integrity, but it takes a trained propagandist to spot, not only openly subversive material which the Communists are hardly stupid enough to try, but the slanted material, the presentation in a script of social comment of a hinted-at Communist solution of the problem. There have been examples of that which employers themselves have caught after protest, but there is no sense setting up a general statement that script-content editing is a bulwark against slanted material.

I do not mean to question the integrity or patriotism of the script editors. It is simply a matter of training.

On pages 260, 261, and 262, the Jahoda report comments on several plans which have come up within the industry in attempted solutions of so-called blacklisting. One was by a professor, I believe, at Cornell University named Robert Cushman, who suggested a sort of private court and outlined the entire machinery. It was to be operated largely by the unions. There was another proposal at one time that three clergymen, a Catholic, a Jew, and a Protestant be set up as a hearing court, and there have been other plans discussed, all of which have not come to anything for a variety of perfectly good reasons.

Employers will not get together on such things for fear of running afoul of the conspiracy laws, and it was generally felt that they do not get to the root of the matter, and they cannot, by their nature. The Jahoda portion comments on the fact that perhaps this diversity of approach to this problem which results from the absence of any institutionalization of that kind and that all employers approach it each in their own way is a good thing, and with this, AWARE agrees.

We believe on the one side that a person who associates himself with the Communist movement is responsible for his own acts, and most particularly in this country, under our Constitution.

By the same reasoning, an employer should be responsible for his own judgments and to take praise or blame as they may come out. So, it is just as well that we have no fixed machinery to which everyone is attached by agreement, sort of a greased chute down which the little pigs would go on the way to slaughter, or on the way to rescue as it might be.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Milton, may we clear the record here on 1 or 2 points so that there will be no possible misunderstanding? Is there in your judgment a Communist fraction within the Actors' Equity Association?

Mr. MILTON. On the basis of the names I read off, and on the basis of the evidence before this committee last August 1955, I would say yes.

Mr. ARENS. How extensive, in your judgment, is the Communist operation in the entertainment industry and television and in radio, in which you have a specialty?

Mr. MILTON. In number of Communists, the actual number of Communists was estimated before this committee yesterday, and I cannot improve on that estimate. I would only point out that actual number of Communists in any given industry has always been small by choice of the Communists.

Mr. ARENS. How about the influence or the impact?

Mr. MILTON. I am coming to that. The number of fellow travelers has been estimated by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover at 10 per Communist, as it were, but the influence shows itself chiefly in that the Communists have been able to exert leverage on those who describe themselves as liberals. I mean no derogation of those who describe themselves as liberals whatsoever, but the fact remains that this is a great leverage against efforts of so-called hard anti-Communists.

Hard anticommunism in any field has always aroused the opposition of the liberal element or what in the report is described as the great middle mass which he says is anti-Communist and I think we need not quarrel with that definition except to point out that it is anticommunism which is most often manifested by acting against anti-Communists.

Mr. ARENS. How effective has this so-called blacklisting been in the radio and television industry in precluding Communists and those in Communist activities from employment in the industry?

Mr. MILTON. I would say that on the record as most recently observable in broadcasting, that the identified Communist does not appear, the fifth-amendment witness finds employment almost impossible to obtain, and I am speaking now of the actor, but some Communist writers and fifth-amendment witnesses have been able to go on writing behind frontmen as recounted in the report. That is quite true and once the Radio Writers Guild in one of its membership bulletins stated that was going on about 3 years ago.

That could not proceed very far without the connivance of somebody in the employer's office. The person with a substantial front record may obtain employment some places and not others. The persons with lesser front records fall in the same sort of gray area. As the public discussions of this issue continue, more and more of the fronters are having attention directed to them which we believe is a healthy situation in that it may bring them to realize that knowingly or unknowingly, they got caught on the wrong side of the street.

We would hope that that public discussion would induce them to take action to repudiate what they have done.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Milton. That would conclude the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. I have a few questions.

In your judgment, is the Communist menace increasing or decreasing in the entertainment field with which you claim to be familiar?

Mr. MILTON. I would say it is substantially the same as it has been, although its emphasis may have shifted.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand then that the work of this committee and the Senate committee and all of the private agencies of which you are representative of one, has been of no substantial effect?

Mr. MILTON. By no means. The open manifestations of the Communist Party have been decreased, I would say, in many places, and that could only have been brought about by the work of bodies such as this committee. The party has elsewhere gone underground.

Mr. DOYLE. I notice that you use the word "open," and my question which I asked a minute ago was directed to whether or not the total Communist conspiracy had been increased or decreased and I understood you to say it was about the same.

Mr. MILTON. With the qualification that the emphasis has shifted from the open activities. There are fewer fronts, for instance, because people are learning that it is dangerous to associate themselves with fronts, but very often the same influences are exerted.

Mr. DOYLE. I made this note here and I am just seeking information and I am not going to get into the area of these books because I have not read them. You stated a minute ago that "persons with substantial front records can get some employment." I wrote that down.

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that was your exact wording?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Does that mean that in the entertainment field, the employers knowing of their substantial Communist-front records are now employing people with substantial Communist-front records?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir. In the New York Times of Thursday, July 12, there was a report from Albany that the court of appeals had upheld the dismissal of a libel action by an actor, Joe Julian, against Red Channels. Now, Joe Julian was cited in the book Red Channels in 1950 with the record of his Communist Party affiliations, although he was not identified as a Communist.

He sued for libel in New York City Supreme Court and after he put in his case, further trial was ended and the case was dismissed and the defendant did not even have to be heard in the opinion of Supreme Court Justice Irving Saypol. That verdict was appealed by Julian, and yesterday the court of appeals upheld the dismissal.

I was going to prove my point that here is Mr. Julian who has not repudiated the front record as given 6 years ago, and only 2 weeks ago I believe he appeared on one of the major television shows.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you this question, again looking for information, because I am frank to say it is quite shocking to me that you as a claimed expert give the opinion that the load of Communists and Communist activity, while it is not as open as it was, is substantially the same as it was a few years ago.

Mr. MILTON. With the shift in emphasis that I said.

Mr. DOYLE. With the shift not being so open about it.

Mr. MILTON. This would not be possible in my opinion without the leverage that is exerted among those who take the "liberal position" as they use the term, which is to say that they prefer broad methods of education to end the Communist conspiracy rather than the name, date, and place exposure of the individual Communist or fronter as the case may be.

Mr. DOYLE. By the term "leverage on the liberals," do I understand that the liberals, however you refer to by that term are using a leverage against communism?

Mr. MILTON. No; I mean that the Communists are able to arouse or raise the issue of an invasion of civil rights, and many people take

this claim seriously, and that by exposing a Communist or a Communist frontier you are invading that person's civil rights. There are many persons who believe that claim. I do not. But they do.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this then: I am not sure that I understood your answer. I understood you to say that AWARE believes, that is your organization, that a person with a Communist record should not be employed?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What about the Communists who claim or are claimed by some of the witnesses who appeared before us in the last 2 or 3 days, that there have been about 100 Communists rehabilitated? Should not they be employed?

Mr. MILTON. Oh, certainly, and I only speak of the persons with significant and unrepudiated records of association.

Mr. DOYLE. Then you would go along with the other witnesses that a Communist who claims to be a rehabilitated one, and to all intents and purposes has rehabilitated, should be again employed in the entertainment field?

Mr. MILTON. Absolutely, and I believe I said earlier, sir, that we think the best solution is not the destruction of the careers of these persons, but that they themselves cut off connections with the Communist apparatus, and thus rehabilitate themselves.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean if the rehabilitation on the part of the individual is a sincere one?

Mr. MILTON. That is assumed; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question? I do not know that you heard it yesterday, and I was not here all of the time due to another committee meeting, but there has been testimony that at least there were phone messages, and so forth, back and forth between individuals interested in rehabilitating Communists.

Have you been called by any person to cooperate in the rehabilitation of Communists? Does your area of activity enter into that field?

Mr. MILTON. No, sir; AWARE does not participate in that activity.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have just one question and probably it is outside the realm of this particular investigation. I have enjoyed listening to you testify and I have noted the logic you have used, and I know that you are a very well informed man. My question is this: Would you care to make any comments on the so-called "everything is made for love" policy of the Soviet Government at the present time? Do you think it represents their honest policy or is it just a change in the Communist Party line?

Mr. MILTON. I do not qualify myself as an expert on foreign policy or on the particular policies of the Kremlin, but I would take the position that until there are deeds evidencing a change, there has been no change. I see no deeds evidencing a change.

May I, Mr. Arens, add one or two words dealing with the nature of AWARE, that may put some of my remarks in a proper perspective here?

AWARE, Inc., is an organization of persons both in and outside of the field of entertainment-communications and the fine arts. We confine ourselves to that area. We perform no services, paid or unpaid, direct or indirect, for any union or employer. We issue membership

bulletins and occasionally we issue one beyond the membership, commenting on evidences of Communist influence in the entertainment field.

I would just at the end, repeat our hope to the committee that it will provide an opportunity for persons who believe themselves to have been blacklisted, to appear before the committee and AWARE is ready to help them by forwarding their names, if it learns of any, to the committee. And, also, reiterate the appeal to those who have at any time in the entertainment-communications field, taken any constitutional refuge before this committee to return before this committee of their own accord and tell the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say that we have extended an open invitation over a period of years to persons who feel that they have been injured in anywise by testimony adduced before this committee. We have actually invited 41 people to come to this committee, because of the serious accusations made against them and not one single person has availed himself of the opportunity to set the record straight.

Mr. SCHERER. Because the record is straight.

The CHAIRMAN. Because the record is straight, I might add.

Are there any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. How long has AWARE been publishing?

Mr. MILTON. We are an organization and not a publication. It was in December of 1953, when we had our initial press conference in New York City in the Hotel Groton.

Mr. JACKSON. Could you tell me in round figures how many people during the course of publications had their alleged Communist or purported Communist-front activities documented in AWARE?

Mr. MILTON. By AWARE, you mean?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MILTON. Let me make a rough guess, sir. Roughly, 33.

Mr. JACKSON. Did any legal action grow out of any of those?

Mr. MILTON. Yes, sir, one suit for libel has been filed against us by John Henry Faulk, a CBS disk jockey, and a second vice president of New York local, AFTRA. We cited in our publication 16, which was issued February 10, 1956—two months after his election as second vice president—we cited seven reported occasions of his association with Communist fronts or caucuses. We did not call him a Communist and in fact, specifically stated in the bulletin that we were not calling that group a Communist group. Thereafter, Mr. Faulk sued for libel and we have replied and we believe that we have the documentary evidence supporting our allegations, and he is not a Communist, but a person with Communist-front affiliations, and that we have put on the public record.

Mr. JACKSON. I think in any discussion of so-called blacklisting, we can break this down into three general categories. I asked this for your affirmation or any suggestion you may have. First of all, we have those persons in the entertainment field who, for one reason or another, have been brought before various agencies or committees of Government and have cooperated to the extent that they have told of their own activities and of the activities of others.

Secondly, we have those who have been subpoenaed and who have refused to cooperate and refused to discuss any of the allegations.

Then, we have the third group, and I think this is the group probably which is more in the spotlight in this report and that is a group

against whom certain charges have been made, but who have not, to this time, been subpoenaed or been given any opportunity to appear in any place except the FBI perhaps, of which we would have no knowledge because of the nature of the FBI's operations.

However, we have those three groups, the cooperative, the noncooperative, and those about whom there is this gray area because they have not appeared.

That third group is the group about which I am more concerned than the other two. The other two are fairly clear cut.

What would your suggestion be as to what should be done in the area of the third group in order to clarify the atmosphere with respect to their charges that they have been blacklisted?

Mr. MILTON. That was directed to that group, that I made the statement before, that if this committee would provide a forum to hear those persons even in the absence of any evidence that they are or were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. That bears out a suggestion I made the other day, and the chairman has just said, and it is very true, that when testimony is developed in an open session of this committee, the person or the individuals who are there named for the first time are notified by the committee of the fact, and the time and place of the hearing and the allegations made and they are invited to come forward and make any statement they care to make.

They have not seen fit to do so. However, to this time, this invitation has not been extended beyond those who were here named, and I would suggest again that if we can get the identities of many of these anonymous people who have made claims to the investigators or compilers of this report to have them come before the committee and I would say with a process of subpoena, rather than invitation, in order to assure their presence here, to determine in what manner and by whom and under what circumstances they were blacklisted.

I think that we should certainly do that.

The CHAIRMAN. I would think in that connection it would be much more convenient for us to ask the authors of this report to extend the invitation on our behalf. They know who they are and they can say that we are perfectly willing and anxious to be of assistance in removing whatever injustice has been done, and we authorize Mr. Cogley to extend an invitation to each of these persons and we will be very happy to hear them.

Mr. MILTON. The point I would just touch on once again is that many persons claim to be blacklisted who have not been charged with Communist Party membership. That is here or anywhere else, but have the records, public records of association with the Communist-front apparatus.

Now, it may turn out after the most exhaustive investigation that they are or were not members of the party, and yet encounter resistance to employment because of their front record.

Mr. JACKSON. We have a very practical problem in that connection. If the committee undertakes to call before it and subpoena before it everyone who has a record of 10 or more Communist-front affiliations, the committee can do nothing else for the next 50 years than to hear that group. Quite rightfully, I think the committee has confined its operations in recent years to calling those who have been identified as members of the Communist Party.

That is the reason why we have not been able to go into the extensive and often provocative records of many hundreds of individuals.

Mr. MILTON. Of course, I think that is widely understood, sir, and the point is now that this general line of inquiry, because of the Fund's report, has taken a slightly different turn.

Mr. JACKSON. I think this puts an entirely different aspect on it and for my part, I would like to bring in some of these people and find out whether or not they have any grounds for their statement that they were blacklisted.

The CHAIRMAN. How can we bring them in? We do not know who they are. The man who makes the allegation knows, and we do not.

Mr. JACKSON. I would certainly require him to lift the cloak of anonymity on them. I would not have him extend any invitation on behalf of the committee. I think that is a function of the committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Your idea is to bring the individual before this committee and let him point them out?

Mr. JACKSON. If Mr. X says he has been blacklisted let us find out who Mr. X is and what his record is and whether he has been a member of the Communist Party, and find those things out and put them on the record. So that these statements which are made, and we do not know whether they may be one of these composite things pulled out of thin air, and let us find out from the individual concerned if he has been blacklisted and if he has been blacklisted as blacklisting is interpreted in this book, find out why he was blacklisted.

Mr. DOYLE. May I suggest this, right along that line, that if there is a Mr. X, using that for the purpose of this observation—

The CHAIRMAN. No; quoting from the book.

Mr. DOYLE. If Mr. X claims in the book, or if it is related in the book that Mr. X claims he was blacklisted, assuming that we may not be able to get the information otherwise, let us give Mr. X an invitation to come to this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, then, I will designate you as a subcommittee of one to serve him with a subpena.

Mr. JACKSON. I dare say, Mr. X is probably not very much interested in sitting down in that chair and discussing the record which brought about his blacklisting.

Mr. SCHERER. That is obvious from the questions asked by our counsel yesterday of some of the witnesses. He pointed out that the Fund for the Republic in this report did not disclose the fact that many of the individuals mentioned in that report had been identified before this, and other other committees, as Communists. The publication is silent.

The CHAIRMAN. You are overlooking one thing more. Mr. Cogley, under oath, refused to tell us who Mr. X was.

Mr. SCHERER. That is true. I had passed but I just have one question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Milton, do you have any opinion as to why the Fund for the Republic made the so-called investigation into the subject of blacklisting?

Mr. MILTON. I have to characterize my opinion as pure speculation.

Mr. SCHERER. I first asked you if you had such an opinion, and if you have no opinion, you can say "No." You are an expert. My colleague said, a so-called expert. I think you are an expert.

Mr. MILTON. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to know first, whether you have an opinion as to why the Fund for the Republic engaged in this investigation into blacklisting. I have an idea, and I wanted to see whether or no yours confirmed mine.

Mr. DOYLE. Is not that so highly speculative? Assuming that he is an expert, unless he knows why the Fund or why Mr. Cogley made this report, I do not think it is adding anything to the substantial value of this hearing.

Mr. SCHERER. Committees always ask experts for their opinions. Even in court we ask an expert's opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. He has stated it will be speculative. We want substantial stuff, and not that kind of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have your opinion.

Mr. MILTON. The Fund for the Republic has dedicated itself on its own statements to investigating the influences of communism and possible invasions and infringements of civil rights, so-called. Part of that area of inquiry is the operation of those principles in the field of entertainment-communications. Certainly, by the first, by the cries of the Communists in the entertainment-communications, and later by non-Communists who echo the cry, the Fund deemed that civil rights or civil liberties had been and were being invaded in the entertainment-communications.

Unfortunately for this purpose, for the service of truth, this report, I think, gives no clear picture whatsoever, whether it is favorable to the hard anti-Communist or favorable to the non-Communist, or favorable to the Communists. It is simply not accurate at all. But that, I believe, as I said, was the purpose, to investigate an area in which the Fund believed that civil rights were endangered, infringed, or at least quarreled over.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, in view of that answer, that we are bound to give the Fund representative, whoever it might be, the opportunity to come forward in their behalf.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to tell you that the representatives have been told in writing and orally that they will be given an opportunity if they see fit to present testimony. I personally told one of the directors of the Fund, I personally told their lawyer, and Mr. Arens told their lawyer and we wrote them a letter, so that there can be no question but what that opportunity will be given. By repeatedly suggesting that they be given the opportunity, the very clear intimation is being made that they will not have the opportunity. I repeat with all of the force of my command, that if it ever becomes material to the issue, they will be extended an invitation to present testimony.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was going to ask Mr. Milton if he agrees with me that following your thought you expressed just a few minutes ago, that as far as some of the writers on that report are concerned, their feelings also might be indicated by their intense dislike of this committee?

Mr. MILTON. I could not speak on that of my own knowledge. I met two of the report investigators and we did not discuss the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

May I revert for a moment to our previous subject of why the report was done, and it says on page roman numeral vii of the volume

II: "At the time this study was launched, such blacklisting was a subject of vigorous public controversy, involving civil liberties issues of a serious kind." So they have said why they did it, and I tried to give a fair restatement of that reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Cogley was asked that question and he testified on that question for several minutes the day before yesterday, as I recall.

Mr. SCHERER. Of course, it is possible that they may state one reason, and actually have another objective. I think from the evidence that has been developed during these hearings, that their objective may be somewhat different than their stated purpose. I may have something to say about that at the conclusion of the testimony and after we hear the Fund for the Republic representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not investigating the Fund for the Republic at all. We are investigating alleged blacklisting, and it just happens that in the course of our inquiries there cropped up—what do you describe that as being?

Mr. MILTON. A report.

Mr. SCHERER. I might call it a white paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Mr. ARENS. No further interrogation of this witness, and we have two other witnesses, who are ready to appear this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes. (Brief recess.)

(Statement submitted for AWARE, Inc., by Paul R. Milton, chairman, information committee:)

AWARE, INC.

(An organization to combat the Communist conspiracy in entertainment-communications, and the fine arts)

NEW YORK CITY, 7 July 1956.

To the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

(About Report on Blacklisting, Part 2, Radio-Television, Fund for the Republic, by John Cogley and Marie Jahoda)

AWARE, Inc., is an interreligious, interracial, politically nonpartisan organization of professionals and nonprofessionals, incorporated under the laws of New York State.

In commenting on the Report on Blacklisting, it is proposed to limit our remarks to matters of fact as much as we can. Also included are comments on definitions, on omissions, etc.

We begin by drawing attention to a failure to define. The terms "rightwing" and "leftwing" are often used in the report without definition and hence have only such meaning as the report attached to them in the secrecy of its writers' minds. The same absence of scholarly responsibility is to be seen in other passages. For instance, on page 46:

The report, while freely identifying anti-Communists throughout, often retreats into anonymity when referring to others. For example: "More than one anti-Communist producer has said that he would not hire him because of this fact" (that actor Vinton Hayworth had allegedly become "controversial" because of his connection with AWARE, Inc.).

It seems fair to ask: what "faceless-informer" producers made this irresponsible, because not attributed, statement and to whom? On what evidence are they characterized as "anti-Communist"?

Page 47: "In February, the show used Lois Jacoby, a writer who was later to follow [Irvel] Tunick out of Television Authority when a West Coast functionary of that organization invoked the Fifth Amendment."

The foregoing paragraph suffers from the omission of detail necessary to a properly researched study of the Communist issue in unions.

The facts, briefly, were as follows, all fully reported in the trade and general press: From 1950 onward, radio, television, screen, and dramatic writers fought among themselves over television jurisdiction: Should it lie with an existing union or some new one? One attempt to organize a new jurisdiction originated in Hollywood, the Television Writers of America, independent. (This, incidentally, is what the report's above paragraph is actually talking about, not Television Authority, which was the interim form and name while the radio actors' union became the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists—AFTRA.)

Presently the new TWA won an NLRB election among television writers, giving it partial jurisdiction—in the face of warnings of Communist taint in its West Coast leadership; one such warning was a nationally syndicated column by Victor Riesel; another was a later summary of TWA's troubles inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator Butler, of Maryland. The apprehension was based on the Communist-front record reported in connection with TWA's first president, Richard Powell (not the actor), and the background of the executive secretary, Joan LaCour.

Many New York writers joined TWA anyway, confident they could handle the Communist issue if it sharpened. Their hopes were dashed, however, when Joan LaCour, charged with Party membership before HCUA in Hollywood, took the Fifth Amendment. When TWA's West Coast board did not discharge her, most of the Eastern officers and directors headed by Irve Tunick left the organization. Later it called a futile strike and soon afterward faded out entirely.

The TWA episode was a classic example of the destructiveness of Communism upon unionism. There were few so-called "hard" anti-Communists involved; most described themselves as "liberals," of the kind frequently placed by the report in later pages in the "middle" between the extremes of Communism and "hard" anti-Communism. Yet the "liberals" took a "hard" anti-Communist position; they resigned virtually in a body and in effect ended whatever chance the fledgling union might otherwise have had in the television field.

Full research of this episode might have provided an important lesson for those who believe that a sound union can tolerate Communism. It is a shame it was omitted from the report.

Page 47, last paragraph:

"On the other hand, there are shows where the employment record indicates a constant use of people associated with the left wing. In 1950-51, 'Danger' used performers like Lee Grant, Morris Carnovsky, Alan Manson, Lou Polan, John Randolph, Elliott Sullivan and others who have been accused of being antagonistic to the right wing, as well as Peter Lyon."

Here is an interesting example of the report's frequent resort to murky terms—left wing, right wing, as well as the suppression of properly identifying data.

In 1950-51, perhaps more suspicion than fact attached to the names mentioned. But the report was researched and written in 1955-56 and the names might have been identified, for the reader's benefit, as follows:

Lee Grant, public record of association with the Communist-front apparatus, partially published in AWARE Publication 12, of December 27, 1954.

Morris Carnovsky, Alan Manson, Lou Polan, John Randolph, and Elliott Sullivan have been identified as Communists before HCUA, some in August 1955.

Peter Lyon was named a "hard-core Communist" by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952 and in his own testimony employed the Fifth Amendment over 20 times in response to questions about Communist Party membership and connections.

Yet all the report says about them is that they "have been accused of being antagonistic to the right wing."

Page 56: A similar example of the suppression of identifying data: the phrase "**** Facts About Blacklist, a newsletter published by a group of blacklisted writers. ****"

This is a strangely incomplete description of the two editors of Facts About Blacklist. One was Sam Moore, long writer of the radio program The Great Gildersleeve, past National President of the Radio Writers Guild as well as a frequent council and committeeman—who has been named a Communist before HCUA more than 7 times and who, in his own HCUA testimony in 1951, refused to admit or repudiate a Communist Party card bearing the name Sam

Moore, and who resorted to the Fifth Amendment in answer to all questions about his relations with the Communist Party.

The other editor of *Facts About Blacklist* was the writer Walter Bernstein, with a significant and unrebutted Communist-front record.

Facts About Blacklist, which appeared twice, was printed by Advance Printing Co., union label 264, well-known as the printshop favored by Communist fronts such as American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Civil Rights Congress, Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case, Theater Rally to Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs, Emergency Civil Rights Committee, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, etc., etc.

Yet the report describes *Facts About Blacklist* merely as "a newsletter published by a group of blacklisted writers."

Page 69, second paragraph: "It [an action of CBS] was founded on the notion that communism was totally a conspiracy and not 'political' at all."

This is one of the very few times in the report that the Communist Party USA is conceded to be part of a conspiracy. Even so, the report dismisses it as a mere "notion," ignoring the findings of the Supreme Court of the United States (for example, *American Communications v. Douds*), the Subversive Activities Control Board, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not to mention authoritative writings by Lenin, who commanded conspiratorial methods; and J. Peters in *The Communist Party—A Manual of Organization*.

The report is not obliged to agree with the "conspiracy" estimate of the CPUSA, but a scholarly approach would at least have set forth why the term "political" is used where "Communist" would have been clearer. The term "political" is used as a euphemism for "Communist" over 40 times in the first section of the report.

Page 76: The Voice of Freedom Committee provides another example of the suppression of significant identifying data. The Voice of Freedom Committee, about which certain facts are correctly stated, showed interest always and only in Communist matters and persons. Further, it has been cited subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, which the report does not mention.

Page 79: Clifford J. Durr, then a Federal Communications Commissioner, is not identified as a later president of the National Lawyers Guild, described by HCUA as "the legal bulwark of the Communist Party" and soon to be heard by the Subversive Activities Control Board as an organization cited subversive by the Attorney General.

Page 80, in commenting on William S. Gailmor, Roderick B. Holmgren, Lisa Sergio, Johannes Steel and J. Raymond Walsh, radio commentators, the report again suppresses significant identifying data.

Gailmor has been named a Communist in sworn testimony and has been the fund-raising speaker at many Communist-front meetings.

Roderick B. Holmgren, whose bewildered report of what befell him after appearing in *Red Channels* is on pages 82-83 of the report, was a one-time Midwest vice president of the now defunct Radio Writers Guild, was later identified as a Communist employed by the Communist-dominated Mine-Mill-Smelter Workers Union (ejected from the CIO) and, while testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, took the Fifth Amendment when shown a Communist Party card bearing the same name as his.

Johannes Steel, described in the report, on Steel's say-so, as "an Eisenhower-Republican formerly a Roosevelt Democrat," drew this public comment from Frederick Woltman, New York World Telegram and Sun, on June 25, 1956:

"* * * Johannes Steel, one of radio's chief pro-Soviet propagandists of the 1940's. This writer [Woltman] in 1946 described him as 'an all-out defender of Stalin's policies, with a special bent for Soviet worship.' Steel never objected. And evidently the Fund's researchers didn't care."

Page 82: In stating that Arthur Gaeth "formerly broadcast over ABC for the United Electrical Workers Union," the report suppresses the fact that UE was ejected from the CIO as a Communist-dominated union in 1947 and that several of its officers have been named as Communists in sworn testimony. That would not prove that Gaeth was a Communist, but it might have given the reader a hint of Gaeth's general approach.

Page 92: "In some cases the 'clearance men' have sold their services as public-relations consultants and speech writers to the artists going through a 'clearance.'"

It is AWARE's conviction that "clearance" and "self-clearance" should be unmarred by the passage of money. The report ought to name the "clearance men" referred to above.

Page 107, next to last paragraph: "Pete Seeger of the Weavers was listed in Red Channels."

The report appears to suffer from shyness about the word Communist, which is remarkable in a book about Communism. Seeger was more than simply "listed in Red Channels." He has been named a Communist in sworn testimony before a congressional committee; the Weavers group is a favorite at CP front gatherings.

Page 117: "As an ex-Communist and paid Government witness, Matusow had been instrumental in getting 13 Communist Party leaders convicted for Smith Act violations."

The implication here is that Matusow was the decisive witness against the 13. But in fact, a court ruled later that the convictions stood without Matusow's testimony, which was partial and corroborative, not basic.

Page 121, footnote: "These are not to be taken as literal lists."

Cf. page 165, quote of faceless informer Bart: "I (the reporter) asked him if, when he decides to take an actor as a client, he checks the name against any of the blacklists."

If there are no literal lists, how could "Bart" check them? A quibble? But murkiness in use of terms is a regrettable characteristic of the report and the examples add up.

Page 128, speaking of the situation at CBS, second paragraph ends: "If he (a performer) would come bearing credentials, or implicit agreement, from AWARE, Inc., Counterattack, the American Legion, or George Sokolsky, so much the better."

Spokesmen for AWARE, Inc., told the Report's interviewers that AWARE, Inc., does not consider itself a clearing agency, does not issue "rebirth certificates" or "clearance" papers or letters of any kind. Nor does it do indirectly—over the phone, by lifted eyebrow or smoke signal—what its policy forbids it to do directly.

Since the report does not mention, does not possess and has never seen any "clearance" paper issued by AWARE, Inc., what is the basis for the inclusion of AWARE in the quoted paragraph?

Page 129, first and second paragraphs: "In the spring of 1955, the NBC network, wanted to clear a prominent performer for a top dramatic show, asked the actor to get two letters of endorsement, one from an officer of the Anti-Defamation League, the other from Godfrey P. Schmidt, President of AWARE, Inc. * * *

"At one time the letter from the Anti-Defamation League official would have turned the trick, but in this case it took two endorsements. And of the two (as the actor found out), AWARE's was harder to get."

In fact, the actor was Albert Dekker; the program was Television Playhouse sponsored by Goodyear Tire & Rubber. AWARE, Inc., gave no endorsement whatever, though Mr. Schmidt did, as an individual, on his own stationery, as fairly noted on page 133, last paragraph.

More interesting in the quoted paragraphs: AWARE, Inc., is equated with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith as an influence in entertainment-communications. But the report index lists only three incidental references to the Anti-Defamation League, while AWARE, Inc., bulks almost as large as CBS, Counterattack, and the American Legion, and slightly larger than the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

AWARE, Inc., is not informed about the nature of the reported influence and activities of the Anti-Defamation League with respect to "clearance" procedures; perhaps the industry and the general public are not informed either. The report has denied its readers the benefit of a comparison between AWARE's approach to the Communist issue, which it does not like, and the ADL's. The omission is noticeable.

Let it be noted, however, that AWARE, Inc., in no sense seeks to engage in rivalry for influence with any organizations except Communist organizations.

Page 134, first paragraph: "In its support of political screening, AWARE operates according to this logic: Communism is a conspiracy; therefore Communists and all those who collaborate with them, knowingly, or not, are conspirators."

Correction: Exactly on the opposite page, the report quotes from AWARE itself in contradiction. The selection is from *The Road Back* (self-clearance),

which suggests certain actions that may be taken in self-clearance. The report quotes:

"2. Recognition that, *whatever the subject's intentions at the time*, his name, efforts, money or other support gave aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy."

The italicized phrase clearly contradicts the report's prior summary of AWARE's logic.

Page 131: The Alliance is described as "a coalition of rightwing patriotic societies."

In fact, The Alliance, of which Mr. Archibald B. Roosevelt is President, is an alliance only of individuals. The report evidently confuses The Alliance with The American Coalition, which is a Nationwide coalition of patriotic societies. As to being "rightwing," why the distinction? Can the report name a coalition of "leftwing" patriotic societies?

Page 131, second paragraph: "In February 1955, AWARE sponsored a forum for young people * * * frankly rightwing."

The purpose of the forum was to explore the educational sources of the crypto Communism which AWARE believes infects some people in entertainment-communications; it was the second such forum, there has since been a third, and next year there will be a fourth. Whatever the forum speakers were, AWARE, Inc., takes no position on any political or sociological matters; only on Communism.

The same paragraph continues: "To many anti-Communists in the industry, AWARE is barely differentiated from other rightwing political groups (even though from time to time it speaks as if its patriotic interests transcend partisan issues) and they want no part of it."

This paragraph raises questions that should have been answered in the same paragraph. What anti-Communists feel that way? In what way is AWARE "rightwing," considering that the report never defines the term? Or is "right-wing" supposed to refer to "hard" anti-Communism as opposed to temporizing methods? Why the phrase "as if its patriotic interests transcend partisan issues"? Why the gratuitous "as if," when many persons anonymously quoted elsewhere in the report seem to have gained credence for their irresponsible statements without difficulty? And is Communism only a "partisan issue"? AWARE confesses it cannot follow the reasoning for the murk.

The same quoted paragraph continues: "If they want to support McCarthy and his crowd, that's their business," said one actor, "but why should my patriotism be questioned because I disagree with them?"

Again the report, apparently always quick to denounce the anti-Communist activist, does not scruple to use an ignorant faceless informer against anti-Communist activists. AWARE, Inc. has taken no position on Senator McCarthy because he has no connection with AWARE's field of interest—entertainment-communications (the Government Operations Committee investigation of the Voice of America took place prior to AWARE, Inc.).

The report should name its faceless informer, "an actor," who in turn should state when and where his patriotism was questioned by AWARE, Inc.

Page 133, second paragraph: "AWARE, though it urges universal political screening * * *."

Here again the murky use of "political" when the correct phrase would be "screening for Communist affiliation." AWARE does not urge screening, universal or local, for Democratic, Republican, Liberal, Farmer-Labor, etc., affiliation.

Page 133, third paragraph: "AWARE has not published any public 'lists,' but its bulletins have cited the past political associations of radio-TV workers, a la Red Channels."

AWARE's publication policy was explained to Report interviewers:

AWARE issues an irregular bulletin to its members; only a few such have contained data on Communist or Communist-front individuals and in some 2 years, only four such bulletins have been issued beyond the membership under the heading: "News Supplement to Membership Bulletin," followed by its sequence number. These four were mailed to members, organizations, and interested individuals, some considered friendly, some not. None was mailed to any list of employers or advertising agencies.

Of the publicly distributed publications, No. 12 commented on an AFTRA election closed 9 days before, named some 16 defeated candidates and touched on their connections with the Communist-front apparatus.

No. 13 cited the names and records of eight persons, named as Communists in sworn testimony, who had been among those agitating in AFTRA for the "condemnation" of AWARE, Inc.

No. 16 commented on a later AFTRA election, citing the reported front-apparatus connections of two AFTRA electees.

No. 18 was an analysis of the activities of Playwright Arthur Miller in connection with Communist-front groups, and his loss of a writing assignment from the New York City Youth Board, prior to his recent testimony before this Committee.

In all, AWARE has named 33 persons in connection with the Communist Party or front groups.

Page 154, discussing AWARE publication 12, quotes from it: "Happily, AFTRA is one of the few unions in which flatly declared anti-communism and anti-totalitarianism have won many clear victories."

The report comments: "The first statement, that AFTRA is 'one of the few unions' in which anti-communism is dominant, was itself tell-tale. Given the complete defeat of the Communists in the AFL (where they never had a base) and in the CIO (where their unions were expelled), it could only strengthen the charge that AWARE was anti-union."

AWARE, which confines itself to the entertainment-communications, was obviously not talking about unions outside that area. Within that area, the statement about AFTRA made by AWARE remains true. It is also clearly true of Screen Actors Guild, IATSE West, and a few others. In other unions, the Communist issue remains in unmentioned tension. Before calling AWARE's statement of fact "anti-union," did the report analyze the situations in the more than a dozen other unions in entertainment-communications?

Page 156, second paragraph, the report reminds the reader that among those AFTRAs opposing AWARE were 11 who "invoked either the First or Fifth Amendment at the House Un-American Activities Committee hearing at Foley Square in August 1955."

Here again is the report's repeated reluctance to refer to Communism: What did the 11 invoke constitutional privilege about? The record shows they invoked it in refusing to answer questions about Communist Party membership.

Same page, next paragraph, the report quotes from a letter sent to AFTRA members in May 1955, and attributes it to AWARE. The fact is AWARE did not send that letter and had no responsibility for it; it was prepared and issued by a number of AFTRAs who signed it, as the document itself shows.

Page 158, at the top, the report ends a discussion of "blacklisting" in AFTRA with comments on the "condemnation" of AWARE, Inc., which took place in July 1955, in the New York local. Why does the report omit that within 3 weeks, AFTRA's national membership adopted a rule that any member thereafter refusing to testify before a congressional committee about Communism would be subject to suspension?

Pages 163 to 191 are devoted to summaries of conversations with persons identified only by fictitious initials or nicknames. This section of 28 out of 220 pages in the part of volume II attributed to Mr. John Cogley raises a question about the responsibility of researchers conducting surveys.

These interviews are, because anonymous, irresponsible. The subjects cannot be independently interviewed. There is no indication that the statements made by the "faceless informers" were checked. In a few cases, the disguises of nicknames or initials have already been penetrated and the "facts" given by the "faceless informers" found to be so incomplete as to be misleading. In other instances, persons are quoted who have but the murkiest idea of what the Communist issue is.

Thus the question raised by this section is: Has a document claiming acceptance as worthwhile research the right to quote from ignorance and irresponsibility?

In one respect, AWARE concedes that this section makes a point: It is that these interviews reflect, with minor exceptions, a stunning lack of understanding of what the Communist conspiracy is, of its purposes and methods, on the part of what are supposed to be typical persons in entertainment-communications.

Page 42: "Pitzele charged, among other things, that [Merle] Miller had ignored sources of information on the subject of blacklisting of anti-Communists [in particular, that he had not consulted Morton Wishengrad, a knowledgeable radio writer], * * *."

Comment: Merle Miller, novelist, had been commissioned in 1950 by the American Civil Liberties Union to do a book-form survey of so-called blacklisting in broadcasting. With one or more associates, he carried out interviews. He did, in fact, consult Mr. Wishengrad, but failed to consult certain others mentioned by Mr. Wishengrad. The fact of Miller's interview with Mr. Wishengrad and his failure to explore the writing situation further was covered by Merlyn S. Pitzele in his New Leader Magazine review of *The Judges and the Judged* which, among other things, exposed the faulty research methods used. Later, Louis Berg in Commentary Magazine reported that the American Civil Liberties Union had, in a Board action, virtually agreed with Mr. Pitzele; it did not, however, withdraw the book.

Page 147, third paragraph: "Among those who sought to make the [Radio Writers] Guild into a professional association were a number of the people who were later to form AWARE, Inc."

This is a curiously telescoped and inaccurate statement.

First, an argument in the Radio Writers Guild about professional-society-versus-union seems to have taken place in the late 1930's. By 1950, it had been long dead; only one person revived it: Hector Chevigny in an RWG-election campaign letter to RWG members in 1950. No statement about it ever was made by We the Undersigned, RWG anti-Communist Caucus; only a few of We the Undersigned had even belonged to RWG in the late 1930's.

Second, when AWARE, Inc., was formed and announced (December 1953) the Radio Writers Guild was moribund. Moreover, the report does not know who formed AWARE but the statement may be made here that no champion of a "professional society" RWG was involved.

Page 148: Speaking of RWG: "The result was an 'anti-Communist' ideology largely based on the proposition that there was only one kind of anti-communism, that represented by the right wing. Exceptions were made (Morton Wishengrad, a liberal anti-Communist writer, is acceptable to AWARE, Inc.)."

AWARE, Inc., seems to be the "King Charles' head" of the report; here again AWARE is dragged backward in time. RWG and We the Undersigned were dead when AWARE, Inc., came to life. To say today—3 years later—that Mr. Wishengrad is "acceptable" to AWARE, Inc., implies that he has been somehow "considered" by that organization. Nothing like that ever happened. The only conceivable basis for the report's gratuitous linking of AWARE, Inc., and Mr. Wishengrad is that during an interview about RWG by Mr. Blackman, Report interviewer, the latter asked an AWARE Board member about Mr. Wishengrad, the answer was that Mr. Wishengrad had been a respected, informed, and important member of We the Undersigned. As AWARE, Inc., was not under discussion, nothing could have suggested any connection between it and Mr. Wishengrad.

Page 149: "It was this simplification (into two opposed factions) which got the McCarran Committee into trouble on the very day it released its report on the Radio Writers Guild. One of the central issues before the Guild *at that time* [emphasis added] was a highly publicized resolution submitted by Welbourn Kelley to the Regular Council Meeting, Eastern Region, of the Radio Writers Guild. On July 29, 1950, Kelley had proposed that the Guild offer its services to support America's role in the Korean war. * * *"

There is some error in dates here; the correct sequence of events is—

1. Kelley's Korean anti-Communist resolution(s) came, as stated, in July 1950.

2. The testimony comprising the McCarran Committee Report was taken in Washington and New York between April 27, 1951, and April 1, 1952, and published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 27, 1952—2 years after the Kelley resolutions. By mid-1952 they had little more than historical interest.

Page 151: Here the report treats of the "trouble" into which the "McCarran" [Senate Internal Security] Subcommittee got over Mr. Welbourn Kelley. This passage quotes from a letter made public in September 1952 by Mr. Kelley to the effect that when testifying in executive session about RWG, he had been instructed by Committee Counsel Richard Arens to call his RWG opponents "pro-Communists" and not "leftwingers." Mr. Kelley expressed concern at the harm that would be done to his RWG opponents.

As far as it goes, the report's account of the Kelley letter is accurate; the same cannot be said about its completeness, for Committee Counsel Arens replied to Mr. Kelley in a widely published letter, stating that he had merely asked Mr. Kelley not to use the term "leftwinger" for fear it might be taken to refer to

radicals or leftists, so-called, who were by no means pro-Communist; would Mr. Kelley limit his remarks to those he regarded as pro-Communist, and use that term for clarity? Omission of the Arens letter prevents the reader from making up his own mind on the basis of complete evidence.

Page 150, second paragraph: "Another radio writer who voted against Kelley [on the Korean resolutions] has notarized statements from leaders of AWARE, Inc., attesting that they have no knowledge he is 'pro-Communist'."

King Charles' head again; AWARE, Inc., is dragged into something it had nothing to do with. (Parenthetically, no radio writer or anybody else has statements, notarized or not, from leaders of AWARE, Inc., that he is or is not pro-Communist.)

The facts behind the report's oddly telescoped sentence were supplied, in document form, to Mr. Saul Blackman, Report interviewer.

The "writer who voted against Kelley" was, presumably, Hector Chevigny, an influential RWG member who had been several times a Guild councilman, West and East, and who in 1952 was the administration candidate for national president. In a We the Undersigned election campaign bulletin, in 1952, 13 RWG members were listed who had been identified as Communists before congressional committees: Pauline Hopkins, Sam Moore, Jack Robinson, Reuben Ship, Gene Stone, Louis Scofield, Carl Abrams, Harmon Alexander, Abe Burrows, Mary Robinson, Studs Terkel, Millard Lampell, Peter Lyon. (Today it should be noted that of the foregoing, Abe Burrows thereafter testified before HCUA, generally admitting and regretting past Communist Party membership; Reuben Ship has been deported to Canada, where he wrote the radio play, *The Inquisitor*, for the Canadian Broadcasting System.)

The same We the Undersigned 1952 election bulletin also charged certain RWG members, not Communists, with having run on slates with some or all of the 13; among the non-Communists so charged were Mr. Chevigny and Philo Higley. Both considered that they had, by innuendo, been called Communists and brought libel actions against 30 or so supporters of We the Undersigned.

Neither action went to court. Both were withdrawn when 13 of the defendants named (the others having dropped away for various reasons: separate agreements, nonservice, etc.) provided the plaintiffs with affidavits stating that they had not called either man a Communist and had no knowledge of such connection. Here is the key paragraph, which is correctly given in the report:

"The statements of our opposition to Mr. Chevigny's election made in the said bulletin were not intended to imply that we had any knowledge of any fact which would lead to the belief that Mr. Chevigny was a Communist or a member of the Communist Party or directly or indirectly connected with the Communist Party or that he was, when the bulletins were issued, or that he is now a member of any Communist front or action group or a member of any Communist conspiracy and we do not have any such knowledge." (The affidavit given Higley was almost identical.)

The Chevigny affidavit, later of the two, was dated 12 February 1954. On 18 March 1955, the relevant papers were supplied to a Report interviewer, at his request; with them went a letter from which the following paragraphs are now quoted:

"It has steadily been our (We the Undersigned) position that we did not refer to Mr. Chevigny or any of his companions in that group as Communists. Our statement hinged only on their activities in the Radio Writers Guild with reference to the imputed Communists named. We did not have any evidence that Mr. Chevigny * * * had been a Communist. If we had, it's obvious that he would have been bracketed with the imputed Communists and not separately. Therefore we had no objection whatever to stating, in the final affidavit, that we had no reason to regard Mr. Chevigny as a Communist. However, it will be noted from a reading of the enclosed affidavit that our original statement—of mutual support between imputed Communists and the group of officials and then-candidates, is not referred to and was not withdrawn."

The letter was signed as an individual by Paul R. Milton, formerly active in We the Undersigned. The supporters of We the Undersigned (by early 1954 a group held together only by unwelcome partnership as defendants in a lawsuit) who signed the affidavit given to Mr. Chevigny were: Vera Oldham, Doris Hallman, Knowles Entrikin, House Jameson, Joseph Mindel, Roy L. Deets, Ann Dixon, Jim McMenemy, Gene L. Farinet, Ruth Adams Knight, Paul R. Milton, Stanley Niss, Nora Stirling.

Now look again at the Report quotation on page 150: "Another radio writer who voted against Kelley has notarized statements from leaders of AWARE, Inc.

[emphasis added], attesting that they have no knowledge he is pro-Communist." Only one of the above-mentioned 13 persons may be described as a "leader" of AWARE, Inc., a person who is now 1 among 15 AWARE Directors (Milton); 11 of the 13 are not even members of AWARE. Thus the Report statement is grossly inaccurate.

Comments on part 2 of volume II: "Anti-Communism and Employment Policies in Radio and Television"

This section, executed on a separate grant from the Fund for the Republic, was directed by Marie Jahoda of the Research Center for Human Relations, New York University.

It is, in effect, a study of "morale" in entertainment-communications. Also, in effect, by its use of opinions from persons unidentified, it is a vehicle for the conveyance of unverifiable views and "facts". True, any market survey of customer-preferences is no more than that, but in market surveys the questions involve no morality and no treasonable conspiracy. In a survey like this, anonymity becomes a cover for irresponsibility.

Though this section is better than the first in scholarly manner, it still resorts to unscholarly clichés of the Communist and anti-anti-Communist running fight against anti-Communists. For example, the use of the term "political" where "Communism" or its appropriate variant is called for; the word "political" is so used 14 times.

Again, page 223: Miss Jahoda quotes from a book of her own: " * * * self-appointed individuals and groups * * *" referring to citizen-anti-Communists. "Self-appointed" is a catch-term implying that citizen-anti-Communists are acting extravagantly. But of course they are self-appointed, as is any other activist in our society. What about the ASPCA, the Boy Scouts, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Fund for the Republic, etc.; to what place shall we all go to get ourselves appointed?

The third paragraph, same page: " * * * they publicly call attention to the records of individuals who deviate from their standards of acceptable behavior."

"Who deviate from their standards of acceptable behavior" is the key phrase. Why not say plainly: "Who object to the Communist taint in such records"?

Page 224, second paragraph, discusses motives attributed to anti-Communist activists, some praiseworthy, and then continues: "And some persons suggest that even more naked self-interest—in terms of wishes for personal power or financial gain—plays a role in the motivation of many private organizations and individuals who have set themselves up as judges over other people's beliefs and ideas."

Another snide dig unsupported by an independently verifiable fact. And again, a phrase such as "set themselves up as judges"—as if that were reprehensible in a society founded on the conviction of freedom of expression coupled with individual responsibility for individual acts.

Page 240, quoting "a TV actor on a top level": "If you pay you can get cleared."

This remark emphasizes the dangers of anonymous quotation. The speaker is unidentified, yet behind cover he makes a charge implying criminal extortion.

Did he take his information to the proper legal authorities, the district attorney of New York County, for instance? Does the Report staff know on what information the remark was based? Did the Report staff require supporting facts from the "TV actor"? If the remark was not checked, why not? Here again the question of quoting from ignorance intrudes itself.

Page 248, quoting "one man," not otherwise identified: "Many were thus labeled even though they had been cleared by the FBI."

Once again—why quote from ignorance? J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has stated many times that the Bureau has no power to "clear" anyone, not even Federal employees under investigation. Why does the report print as if true a statement that is false? A corrective footnote might have been inserted. Pages 260-262: On these pages the second section of volume II comments on the various plans which have been put forward within the entertainment-communications field to institutionalize standards of employment and procedure where the Communist issue is involved, and which all failed of adoption for a variety of commonsense reasons.

AWARE agrees with a conclusion of the Jahoda section that in general the treatment of the Communist issue in entertainment-communications would benefit from more openness and less secrecy.

FINAL COMMENT

It is AWARE's opinion that the report suffers fatally from its murkiness of language, its quotations from poorly informed "faceless informers," its apparent reluctance to deal with Communism as a conspiracy and its apparently underlying conviction that anyone held responsible for his Communist actions is somehow an innocent victim.

Throughout the report, those facts which are correct were known before. Other things presented as facts lose their standing because of inaccuracy and the frequent suppression of significant data.

The result is a document which, whatever the earnestness and good intentions of its sponsors, contributes nothing to the better understanding of one aspect of a crisis which confronts not only the whole civilized world, but every individual in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, the next witness is Mr. Godfrey P. Schmidt. Would you kindly raise your right hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Schmidt, do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF GODFREY P. SCHMIDT

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. SCHMIDT. My name is Godfrey P. Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t. I live at 41 Montgomery Place in New Rochelle, N. Y. I am an attorney, and I have my own office at 12 East 41st Street, New York City. I am president of AWARE, Inc. Also I lecture on constitutional law, sometimes on labor law and jurisprudence at Fordham University Law School.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Schmidt, give us just a brief sketch of your personal background, if you please, your education and anything of particular significance in your activities in your life.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I was educated at Fordham University College and Law School. During my training at Fordham Law School I took great interest in the study of communism and the general line of Communist philosophy. That interest was instilled in me by a speech made by Father Edmund Walsh, who was president of Georgetown University, a great expert in this field, as you gentlemen know.

I gave a series of lectures and courses on the subject of communism and the Communist conspiracy during the period, I would say, beginning from 1930 onward. I always reserved at least 4 hours of my courses on jurisprudence to a discussion of the general line of Communist philosophy.

I was selected by Governor Lehman to conduct the Communist penetration investigation of the New York State Labor Department, and I conducted that investigation for a period of some 9 months, beginning in 1939 or 1940—I have forgotten the exact date—and since that time I have constantly given lectures and talks on the subject of communism.

I was interested in the theater and communism from the time I went into private practice in 1944 when I was retained by Frank Fay, who was then under charges at Actors Equity for having called some fel-

low actors Reds. I defended Frank Fay successfully in the sense that I prevented them from doing what they planned to do; namely, to oust him from his profession by taking away his union membership.

Mr. VELDE. What kind of an action was that, Mr. Schmidt?

Mr. SCHMIDT. That was an intraunion proceeding. He was brought up on charges before the Actors Equity Council. He was not allowed to have attorneys present, but I was in an adjoining room and when he had any difficulties he could question me. I also prepared for him the documentation, the bill of particulars, and I sat down with members of Actors Equity who were conducting this investigation, so-called, and told them that I would commence suit against them if they didn't base their decision on substantial evidence.

Mr. ARENS. Yesterday for some period, and today, your associate in AWARE, Mr. Paul Milton, testified. Yesterday he made reference to the organization AWARE and gave a little of its origins and its functions. Unfortunately, at that time some of the members of the committee were not present. I would like to ask you now in the presence of the members who were not here yesterday if you would take a moment to explain to the members what is AWARE, a word about its origin, its activities and functions.

Mr. SCHMIDT. AWARE is an organization of Americans whose purpose it is to fight Communist influence in the field of entertainment communications. I should say about half of its membership is taken from the professions, from the various acting theatrical professions, and the other half are ordinary citizens of various professions and avocations and who are interested in the subject of communism, especially communism in the field of entertainment communications. It is nonsectarian. It is nonpolitical. It has no orthodoxy in the field of religion or politics. It welcomes any person of good will who feels, as we do, that communism is the most unmitigated political, social, and philosophical evil of our time, the one that has more endangered American civil liberties and the American concept of freedom and the dignity of the human person than any previous heresy in all history.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us, if you please, in summary form, of the function of AWARE.

Mr. SCHMIDT. AWARE relies primarily on its right to protest, on the right of free speech and free press. Its purpose is to lay the facts before those who will have to make decisions of one kind or another.

Mr. ARENS. By what vehicle does it operate?

Mr. SCHMIDT. By publishing bulletins from time to time, by conducting forums, by offering speakers to its membership, and so on.

Mr. ARENS. What are the sources of information of AWARE?

Mr. SCHMIDT. The sources of information are documentation of the work of a committee like this one and similar committees of Congress, various research sources that are available. We don't believe, with the Fund for the Republic report, that it is not possible to objectively ascertain some of the infiltrations of the Communist conspiracy in our country. We don't think it is an easy job, but if we felt that it was always a question of AWARE standards or their standards, but never objective standards, we wouldn't be in this. We think that it takes a vast amount of intellectual and moral effort to isolate the right standards and to apply them, but we do believe that it is a worthwhile task, a task that is demanded by the exigencies of our time, and a task

that can be competently handled both by Government officials, like the distinguished members of this committee, and by private persons of good will.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Schmidt, what is "blacklisting"?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Right here I think you have the source of much of the confusion that appears in the Fund for the Republic report because, as I understand that report, you have a variety of definitions and the attack is made in a diffuse fashion precisely because the attack is not always on the same target. It seems to me that from time to time they mean blacklisting as a form of rash judgment which is either calumny or detraction.

At another time—here is one of the most absurd ones in the book, on page 181 volume II:

Blacklisting, according to W. Z., * * * is really an attack on New Deal values.

Then the next page, 182:

The motives of the pro-blacklisting faction * * * are union-busting, anti-New Dealism, and reaction in general. In certain cases, these motives are linked with racism—anti-Semitism, and hostility toward the Negro performer * * *.

It seems to me no serious study made by pretense at scholarship and decent research would quote this kind of definition as worthy of serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't that close to the Communist line?

Mr. SCHMIDT. As I understand the Communist line, it is the Communist line.

Mr. ARENS. What is your appraisal of the objectivity of the report on blacklisting of the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SCHMIDT. The Fund for the Republic report, as I read it and appraise it, is nothing but a partisan and political tract against people whom they identify with tags and slogans while they assert that people like myself have no competence to use contrary tags and slogans. It is guilty of all sorts of suppression of relevant facts, and it makes that suppression on the pretense "this is my way of writing." It seems to me that before you undertake a study of this kind there are certain requirements, certain objective exigencies for a study of this kind. You can't excuse the forgetfulness or neglect of those standards by simply saying, "this is my method of writing."

Mr. ARENS. May I interrupt you right there, Mr. Schmidt, to ask you, in your judgment as devout anti-Communist and as one who has had extensive experience in this field, is it a legitimate concern of a congressional committee that a tax-exempt foundation with vast resources should be making these allegations to which you have been alluding?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I think, from the point of view of our Constitution, it is exactly what the Founding Fathers wanted a congressional committee to do. You take away congressional committees, and I say to you, gentlemen, no newspaper, no private agency, has the power to investigate or the courage to investigate, especially in these days when we have somewhat encouraged a kind of "Caesarized" idea of the power of the executive department and when we have tolerated, it seems to me, a kind of interpretation of the Constitution that is surely but slowly chipping away States' rights.

It seems to me that the only hope for uncovering some of the truth that must be known in this kind of picture comes from congressional committees like yours.

I haven't finished, if I may be permitted to continue, my appraisal of this report.

In the first place, this failure to define and this use of the word, which is in itself a form of denigration, handicaps the book. They have five different definitions quoted from other sources and the one that should be most objective from Webster's Dictionary is not fully quoted, and there is no indication of an omission. On page 27, pages 52, 53, 121, 181, 182, and 237 are other people's definitions.

That fairly leads to what is my definition. What do I say "blacklisting" is, because I don't care what you call a thing, I want to know what is the reality behind the word. Otherwise debating this becomes a futile verbal battle. What is it that AWARE does that is called by these people blacklisting?

I say we are publishing, for a good motive and for a sufficiently grave reason, truthful statements which potentially or actually damage someone by imputing to that someone some unrepudiated and until now hidden fault.

Let me justify that definition by taking it apart because I think it is the heart of this problem. How can you write a learned treatise on something that you have never even defined? Of course, there is a dogmatic assumption here which is the dogmatic assumption behind the Times editorial this morning; that is, that this is a thoroughly un-American art of blacklisting in the entertainment field.

Blacklisting, gentlemen, is not something new under the sun. If you read the Nichomachean Ethics of Aristotle, you read a treatise on detraction and calumny. What is the difference in the great Aristotelian tradition which was picked up even by men like St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Thomas has this magnificently set forth in his tract on detraction and calumny. What do they define detraction to be? The unjustified telling of some hidden fault. That is detraction. Calumny is the telling of a hidden fault when the telling is a lie—in other words, what we would call libel and slander. That is calumny.

I submit that we in AWARE are against detraction and slander. We are against a great many of the fundamental evils that they only tangentially refer to here. But this is not what we do. We do not indulge in slander or libel or detraction or calumny or tale-bearing or backbiting or derision. What is it we have done?

We have published 18 bulletins up to now, and it is our bulletins that have earned for us the reputation that we are blacklisters. These bulletins I am sure have been made available to this committee and, if they haven't been, I will see that they are. We have published 18 bulletins, and in 4 of them we did blacklisting in the sense that I defined and which I will explain in a minute.

In the first instance we did it as an editorial comment on an election in AFTRA. We commented 2 weeks after the election on the fact that the slate that won was defiantly and intelligently anti-Communist and the slate that lost comprised a large number of people with significant repudiated front records.

Now we were intruding in union affairs as if there were some immunization from criticism that would come from people with real or alleged talent. We have no right to criticize a slate. We criticize

the slates put up by real political parties like Democrats and Republicans. If we have that constitutional right, and thank God we have, I see no reason why we should hesitate if we feel we do it reasonably, and we do, to criticize a slate in a particular union.

That was the first time.

The next two times we defended ourselves against an attack. The attack was mounted because of that first editorial comment. We defended ourselves against attack by these people, and we pointed out that the most vociferous attackers were precisely the people with unrebutted front associations.

It seems to me that this takes care of the detraction part because detraction is only the unjustified telling.

Publishing: That means using free speech. That means using free press. That means using the American right to protest.

For a good motive. We are not actuated by malice. We hate no man. We would live to welcome them back. Our primary purpose is to reveal the Communist conspiracy. That is why we published The Road Back and I took a literal translation from the Greek New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, that they should have a change of heart and mind performing deeds fitting this change, as the foreword of this important document that we publish, because we are not interested in attacking people. We are much more interested in getting them to our side, revealing to them the error of their ways when they lend their names in some form to communism.

Gentlemen, it seems to me that it is a matter of ordinary human psychology that when 2 people collaborate to save a man, the 2 people deserve credit and merit. If two people lend their name, their prestige, and their talent to some unworthy cause, to some form of collaboration with communism as a focus of unmitigated evil, whether they intend it or not is beside the point, this is something we have a right to comment on because, gentlemen, it is the effect that is important here as much as the intent. There is a vast moral difference between a baby who sets a house on fire and an arsonist, but the effect, gentlemen, is the same. A lot of people in our day go around with the bland assumption that they can join any kind of nefarious group that collaborates with communism and come out, simply because of the prestige of their name for their talents, without any criticism. Yet they know very well, gentlemen, that if they joined a Nazi front, if they associated themselves with some form of anti-Semitism, they would be attacked from one end of this country to the other, and rightly, because a man holds his reputation in his hand—every one of us. We can hold it on high or we can throw it away. It is our deliberate conduct that does it. We don't run sniveling to some union to rescue us from our own stupidity. If we are wrong we ought to do what every person who is wrong does.

In the long history of human achievement the great people have been the men like St. Augustine or St. Francis of Assisi, who admitted that their earlier lives were wrong and they knew how to take care of it. I hear nothing but talk that these people don't know how to clear themselves. With a little intelligence and a little imagination they easily would know how, it seems to me, because people who were dirty far more, men like Louis Budenz or Betty Bentley, have been cleared. So these people who lend themselves, it seems to me, have an obligation. I am not saying that we are the judges.

Mr. ARENS. I would like to ask you a question at this point, Mr. Schmidt. As I construe certain of the passages of the Fund for the Republic report, there are a number of indictments brought against you and against AWARE. I should like to invite your attention to those indictments. One of the first indictments which I construe the Fund for the Republic report makes is that you identify, you and AWARE, identify as Communists those people who oppose AWARE. What is your observation with respect to that indictment which is brought in the report?

Mr. SCHMIDT. That is an indictment which appears in this Fund for the Republic report which is absolute falsification. Nothing that I or anybody in AWARE has ever said, none of our publications, can be used to justify that slander or that libel. We have said that neutralism is out of place when you are confronted with such a menacing obscenity of mind and spirit and soul as communism. We don't think that you could be neutral here any more than you could be neutral if you were standing on a street corner and saw a hit-and-run driver knock down a small child. It is conceivable that you could say, "This is not my child. This is not my affair. I won't be involved. I won't be an informer. I will be neutral." It is conceivable, I say, but I think it is indecent.

Mr. ARENS. I have still another indictment which I construe from the report was brought against your organization; namely, that your organization has no competent standards of judgment. What is your observation on that indictment? Do you concur with me that that indictment is brought?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Yes; that indictment is brought, and it comes with particularly poor grace, it seems to me, from the Fund for the Republic people because they make more delicate distinctions, distinctions with much less tangible nuances than we have ever tried to make. They make it apparently with the dogmatic assumption that they are practically infallible, because here on page 144, volume II, they talk about pro-Communists. On pages 144 and 145 they talk about the Communist faction. They say that one fact is beyond dispute, that there was a conscious organized caucus of the Communist Party in the entertainment field pushing the Communist Party line in the talent unions. There was. When did it stop, Mr. Cogley?

Mr. ARENS. What are the competent standards of judgment?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I could go on and show you so many distinctions that they make with great abandon and facility, but when we say a man belongs to a front or he has lent his aid and support to a front, we have no standards. I submit we have standards and I submit that this is one of the reasons why this report is so valueless, because they have forgotten the basic problems that lie at the heart of this subject.

I would like to take that before I deal particularly with the special question, because my answer to this presupposes the other.

I say that they have neglected in handling this problem—as scholars would, they have neglected such things as what is the Communist conspiracy, its nature, its instruments, its methods?

Mr. SCHERER. Do you think that neglect was intentional?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I assume that adults who confront themselves with a task of writing a two-volume treatise on blacklisting are not that daft, that they would forget. I am sure it must have been intentional.

Here are some of the basic philosophical problems that they have completely neglected, apart from the Communist conspiracy, its instruments and its methods. They have talked derisively about some people's standards for detecting Communist infiltration, sometimes leaving a subjectivist impression that nobody in this world will ever be competent. At other times adopting a kind of collectivist theory that only government has the right to do it, much as to say that government is so important that it must only be left to Congress. I am sure that no Member of Congress, seriously thinking about it, wants government left only to Congress.

On the day when it does we have lost our country. When the people of our country don't manifest an intelligent interest, because after all you get out of the ballot box only what you put into it, if you put stupidity and ignorance into it that is what you are going to take out of it. It is a duty on people who believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people to interest themselves in these things and in intelligent fashion.

They have neglected the standards for collaboration. Not only have they neglected it—listen to this: They have in this particular passage of the report, on page 97, volume II, they have stated this:

* * * but "collaborator" remains a word open to the several meanings. Is signing a Communist-sponsored petition "collaboration"?

Just imagine asking. That is like Pilate asking "What is truth?" and not staying for an answer. They asked this question and they go on to the next sentence:

It could be clearly so, if that was the intention of the signer.

I refer to what Congressman Scherer just said. There is a difference sometimes between the nature of the act and the intention of the doer of the act. The nature of the act has an efficiency and finality of its own quite apart from the intention of the doer. If I go to a medicine chest with the intention of getting a pill to allay my headache and by accident take poison, I am going to die because the nature of the act contradicts my purpose. This is one beautiful illustration of how the nature of what you do contradicts your intention. I think men are held or should be held to the normal consequences of their actions and their decisions. They have neglected in this a whole treatment of what are the standards for immutability, what are the standards for collaboration, what are the standards for scandal? This is exactly the thing we are inveighing against. We are inveighing against the spectacle of people who are supposed to be adults, who as adults join Communists fronts or participate in activities of Communist fronts and apparently it is all right for them to do it, but when Godfrey Schmidt says they did it, it suddenly becomes all wrong. This is particularly important when you are dealing with the Communist conspiracy because you are not having in the Communist conspiracy the kind of thing that we as Americans are used to.

In America we are used to joining organizations and saying flat-footedly, "I am a member of AWARE and I am proud of it." I wouldn't deny it anyway. But the Communist is not that kind of fellow. He denies it. He is part and parcel of a movement that denies it. He follows knowingly or unknowingly by lending his aid and collaboration, the dictum of Lenin in 1921 when he said the

bourgeoisie have lied about us. "They tell us that we have no system of ethics or morality. We have a very scientific and simple morality, much superior to the hypocrisy of the West," and it comes to this: Whatever advances the dictatorship of the proletariat is right and whatever hinders it is wrong.

This is the thing we are getting at.

Mr. ARENS. You have leveled a number of criticisms here at this report, and I believe you said a few minutes ago that it is worthless. Do you feel that it has any negative impact upon the fight against communism, that a great organization with millions of dollars and great publicity attached to its efforts should come out with a report of the nature which you have characterized.

(Representative Kearney left the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHMIDT. I don't think it could fail to have the negative impact of encouraging the kind of people who, first of all, justify all forms of joining Communist-front organizations. I am sure that the Communist Party high command would be delighted to have every week a document like this come out, because this fronts for a line that it seems to me has been increasing.

I would not have answered, Congressman Doyle, the question that you presented in exactly the same way because I think you have to make a distinction. I think that in one respect communism and Communist-frontism has increased. I think in another respect it has gone backward. It has gone backward largely because of the activities of people like yourselves and the small help that small organizations like ours render. But it has gone forward in this respect: They have successfully foisted on an unsuspecting people a theory of civil liberties that in effect makes the first 10 amendments a suicide pact. It seems to me they have—well, I don't know of any better illustration of it, gentlemen, than this book that Zechariah Chafee just published, *The Blessings of Liberty*. He regards the whole Communist conspiracy in this country, the whole thought of it, as a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. MOULDER. You referred to joining Communist-front organizations and that they should be condemned for it even though they might do so ignorantly. Is that the way I understand your theory?

Mr. SCHMIDT. No; if you listened carefully to my definition, I said for a sufficiently grave reason. Sufficiently grave reason, as I said, involves collaboration. This is exactly what this study fails to do, develop a theory of collaboration. What is collaboration? If a person holds the door open to a thief or an arsonist without knowing it, he has objectively collaborated, materially, but not formally. He didn't intend that. I wouldn't blame him. But it seems to me that it is a little late in the day for adults to lend their names to strings of Communist fronts, and fail to repudiate them and then say we did it in ignorance.

(Representative Doyle left the hearing room.)

Mr. MOULDER. They may fail to repudiate it, but do you know of cases where people joined organizations which at the time were not actually Communist-front organizations but later on became dominated by Communist influence?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Yes; that is right. Judge Pecora is an example in New York. He joined the Lawyers Guild. It was Communist-domi-

nated, but he was intelligent enough to perceive it after a while, and he resigned with great eclat. Nobody would ever think of calling Judge Ferdinand Pecora a Communist or a fronte.

Mr. MOULDER. That is my point.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I say to you that it was the failure, it seems to me, of this report to elaborate on standards of imputability and collaboration, on the meaning of the ethical standards behind detraction and calumny that makes this a political tract and nothing short of a political tract, rather than a serious research job.

Let me give you one example. In the back of the book here in the Jahoda study is an illustration of some of the most inept type of statistical survey I have ever seen. She says on page 238, volume II, about the middle:

When asked what would happen to a person in the industry who is not a Communist now but who attended Communist Party meetings for a short time 15 years ago and was now named in a magazine as a Communist sympathizer, he answered, "He would probably lose his job."

It seems to me, gentlemen, that some questions are so stupidly framed that a man who attempts to answer them in their inchoate form denominates himself a fool for trying to answer. You couldn't possibly answer that question intelligently, because you would have to ask one further question, at least. You say he attended Communist Party meetings 15 years ago? What has he done in between? Has he kept on defending the Communists in Communist Party caucuses within unions?

Let's skip that. Within unions, whether he is a Communist Party member or not, within unions has he stood up and defended the party line? Has he been guilty of nothing but anti-anticomunism? It is not my standard. It is a question of an objective standard. I should have thought that a study like this would have tried at least to isolate some objective standards. They didn't even try.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Schmidt, I would like to invite your attention to language in the report pertaining to the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, appearing on page 211, volume II:

In August 1955 the House Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings on communism in the Broadway theater. Twenty-three witnesses were called and 22 of them turned out to be "unfriendly," invoking the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. In Hollywood or on Madison Avenue, actors that "unfriendly" could expect not to work again until such time as they "cleared" themselves. But the Broadway performers who refused to cooperate with the Walter Committee simply went back to work. In one case, an actor who had invoked the Fifth Amendment had his contract torn up—and was given a new one at higher pay, and for a longer period of time. The actor was not being rewarded for his "unfriendliness," he was being rewarded for his professional ability. And it is ability that still counts on Broadway.

Do you have any observation to make, on the basis of your extensive background and experience with the Communist conspiracy, with reference to that approach to people who were identified as Communist members before the House committee?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I think I could do nothing better in answer to that question, Mr. Arens, than to refer to page 151 of the report itself. On page 151, volume II, of the report it says:

Many of the election slates put forward in the talent unions by the anti-blacklisting group were easy targets for their opponents because there was

equivocation on the issue of communism. The majority of those who protested blacklisting were anti-Communists.

I would agree with that. I am quite sure that the majority of the people in the talent unions who voted against AWARE were anti-Communist. But now listen to this pearl of wisdom:

Yet somehow they believed it necessary to include Communists or well-known fellow travelers on their slates so as not to violate civil liberties.

Where did you ever hear such an inept and absurd theory of civil liberties that you violate American civil liberties in a private group when you fail to put Communists on the slate or fellow travelers on the slate?

It seems to me there is your answer. If the Fund for the Republic thought that this was an important opinion, if they reported it without immediately excoriating as a silly interpolation they were capable of writing the part that you just read to me.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you a question that I think perhaps might be going through the minds of a number of people, "So what?" What difference does it make if the Fund for the Republic did issue this report with these statements? Of what significance is it? Is it a legitimate concern of this committee?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I think it is a legitimate concern of this committee because of the dogmatic assumption, express and often implied throughout this and throughout much of the newspaper comment that walks in where angels fear to tread, because they are saying we are guilty of un-American practices. You are interested in un-American practices. I would welcome an investigation of AWARE any time, any place. You can have any paper we have. You can have any witness we have. We are not afraid to stand before any people and show you that we are not guilty of un-American activities.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it generally recognized among you experts on this subject that the top brass of the Fund for the Republic assert, either directly or indirectly, that it is the activities of this committee that have resulted in this odious thing they term "blacklisting"?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Sure. I don't think there is any doubt about it. I get that.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you another question following that. You said at the beginning of your testimony if this committee was abolished, all other anti-Communist groups would hesitate to go forward in their fight against the Communist conspiracy.

You said that in substance.

Mr. SCHMIDT. No; I wouldn't say that I said they would hesitate. AWARE and people like us wouldn't hesitate no matter what a committee did or failed to do, but we could not be as effective as you people. We don't have the power to speak.

Mr. SCHERER. You would not be effective? You could not go forward effectively?

Mr. SCHMIDT. That is right. The newspapers write all sorts of articles about this, but what has any newspaper done or what has it contributed to really isolate the issues in this matter and to settle them?

Mr. SCHERER. So to stop an anti-Communist group like yours and individuals like you from being effective it would be necessary first

to discredit this committee or stop the activity of this committee; wouldn't it?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I have no doubt about that, sir. It seems to me that every bit of the silly propaganda to the effect that this country is ridden with fear and propaganda because of congressional committees—that book by Zechariah Chafee that I spoke of is full of that sort of thing. I tell you this—

Mr. SCHERER. What we have agreed on just now may explain the type of report that the Fund for the Republic has put forth in this instance on blacklisting?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Oh, I think it does, because I think that men like E. N. Griswold, for example—and I have debated with Griswold on television—men like Griswold stand for an interpretation of civil liberties that I think is absolutely wrong and unconstitutional. I wouldn't want to be shut up by any legislation. I would want to continue the debate. But I am not going to let him shut me up by saying in papers or in books that I am un-American. I can stand before him and any audience in the world I think and defend my point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. There wasn't a handful of lawyers at that meeting in Philadelphia of the American Bar who did not conclude that he was just simply not telling the truth in what he said about the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I must say I read his book on The Fifth Amendment Today. I heard him give that argument when he debated me on the Edward R. Murrow show, and I have no respect for that kind of lack of logic. I say that there is a new gambit, it seems to me, that is coming to the fore. Maybe you haven't heard it. But I have met it. They say to fellows like myself: "What about this question of being an informer? You pretend to be Christians. You pretend to like the Sermon on the Mount. Turn the other cheek. Where is your Christian charity? You are hurting people out of malice." And all that sort of thing.

I say this in answer to that: The same divine Author who gave us the Sermon on the Mount on the last day of His public ministry stood in the Temple courts and seven times uttered the most terrible denunciations in the whole Bible. "Woe to you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites." He was telling that there was a plot of murder afoot. He was informing. So He gave us an example of how we have to act when we are confronted with a terrible crime.

Mr. SCHERER. Getting back now to the questions that I asked you just a few minutes ago with reference to the feeling of the hierarchy of the Fund for the Republic, namely, that this committee is responsible for this odious thing that they have called blacklisting throughout this country, do you have any idea or opinion now as to why the Fund for the Republic produced that report or engaged in such an investigation?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I think they produced that report to carry out and to apply a strange theory of simple liberties, a theory of civil liberties that in effect says that we must tolerate every kind of subversion because (a) you really can't tell, there are no standards for subversion, and in the competition with free ideas error will eventually be blotted out and truth will triumph. I say to you that they don't even believe

that themselves because they constantly attack people like myself who are using civil liberties who propagate our views as un-American, as unconstitutional.

If they really believed in the competition of the other ideas, why not debate this as we would always want it debated. That is to say, go to the essentials. You don't originate this problem. We didn't originate this problem. Communism originated this problem. When you were confronted with a conspiracy of the nature of communism which debauches the mind and the soul of man in more ways and has more victims than ever before in history—900 million victims already and there wasn't a country they took over that they took over by majority vote. There isn't a country they have taken over where they permit the slightest vestige of civil liberties. I say this is the cause for the reaction that says we want to publish for a good and sufficient reason and out of a good motive, a truthful statement about those who collaborate, whether they intentionally do it or not. It is very simple for them to get off that hook, it seems to me. Let them disown it. This is what we would want.

Gentlemen, why do they attack only our kind of blacklisting? Aren't they aware that every trade union in this country when it goes off on a strike or has a blacklist of its own or an unfair list is putting economic pressure on someone who doesn't agree with them?

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Government of the United States, the Civil Service Commission blacklist?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Exactly. What about Dun & Bradstreet? Dun & Bradstreet gets a call for an investigation for a fee. What about every newspaper? Hasn't it happened that newspapers have damaged reputations? Are we going to say to the newspapers you fold up because sometimes you did it by error, and you had to make a retraction and you never could really make that retraction.

It seems to me, a kind that in effect says let Government speak alone, but no private citizen may talk on this subject.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, we have another witness. I don't know whether Mr. Schmidt has concluded his point, sir.

Mr. SCHMIDT. This is the kind of subject you could go on and on, like Tennyson's brook, but I don't want to wear out my welcome.

The CHAIRMAN. I assure you that you won't as far as I am concerned.

Any questions, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Schmidt, of course, I have enjoyed your testimony and I know you are very able. I think you said the only way that we could handle this situation is through publicity. Do you think there is an area of legislation that we could recommend?

Mr. SCHMIDT. No. I have given that a lot of thought, and I would oppose legislation on this particular subject. I think that this is one of those subjects of public debate that should be allowed the arena of public debate. I was amazed by the climax of this second volume, the mountains were in labor and came forth with a ridiculous mouse because the most obvious thing in the world is apparently the conclusion to which they come.

However, a public debate might be initiated to air the facts as well as the assumptions.

I think if you start legislation you will inevitably regiment opinion. You will start to create a kind of dictatorship within this field. I

think there are cases where an employer has the right to discharge people without specifying a reason. I think that this notion that you can't discharge someone without giving him a hearing is a rather ridiculous thing. In the first place, these people didn't give us hearings. They prate condemnation after condemnation against us but they never gave us a hearing. But they say when we criticize someone else for justified reasons we must give hearings. I don't agree with that for a number of reasons. In the first place, if that were true no newspaper should publish its frank and critical appraisal without giving a hearing, which I would deplore. In the second place, you couldn't write history on that theory because you can't give Nero and Caligula a hearing today but we don't need a hearing to prove that they were wrong or to prove that Hitler was wrong. It seems to me that this is an area that is legitimately within the compass of free speech and free press. But I do think that the function that your committee can serve is to give these people who always will come tomorrow, who are never here today, these phantoms who keep saying, "If we only had a forum to which we could present our case, then we would floor them"—I want to see some of those people.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Schmidt, is your organization a self-supporting organization?

Mr. SCHMIDT. It is self-supporting in the sense that it lives on its initiation fees and dues. It sometimes gets gratuities from people, donations, but it is not tax-exempt. We always tell people that they don't get any deduction on their income tax for giving us money. I don't know of any case where we ever got in excess of \$200 from a particular person.

Mr. ARENS. But your organization is attacked by a tax-exempt organization.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I gather so.

Mr. VELDE. Do you think it should be?

Mr. SCHMIDT. The thing that amuses me about this is that little organizations like us, with a treasury that is rich if it has \$2,000 at one time is now feared by an organization which has \$15 million at its command.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I was making is that your organization is supported from subscriptions and from memberships?

Mr. SCHMIDT. That is right. We have no endowments.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Schmidt, do you think the Fund for the Republic is a type of organization that should be tax-exempt?

Mr. SCHMIDT. I suppose that is not my judgment to say, but I do have an opinion on it.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether we are getting out of line here, but I would like to have his opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think he is qualified in that field. Any questions, Mr. Willis?

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to ask one question. I always had in mind that when the expression was used that a person had been blacklisted, that connotes an unjust accusation.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I would say so. You have to consider history.

Mr. WILLIS. What worries me is that the way the word "blacklist" is used in this report it has variations in it.

Mr. SCHMIDT. That is right. You see, Congressman, if you go back in the history of the world it really originated in the field of labor relations.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the origin of it?

Mr. SCHMIDT. It originated in the area of labor relations.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you overlooked World War I, the so-called blacklist?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Yes, but the labor-relations angle antedated World War I by many years, you see. You had blacklisting in the reprehensible practice of some employers though who denied the right of free association to employees and made them unemployable by actually handing to one another a list of the so-called troublemakers. We do not indulge in blacklisting in that sense. Ever since that connotation the word "blacklisting" has had a kind of slur inherent in it, a built-in slur, in other words. We don't do blacklisting in that sense. I say to you that when the Anti-Defamation League does what it has a thorough right to do, isolate anti-Semites and publish the fact that they are anti-Semites, I am for them. I am glad they do it. But is it any easier to find an anti-Semite than a Communist? They don't give hearings, either. They can issue responsible appraisals of a person's anti-Semitism. I think we can do it without hearing, too. I think when you have the spectacle of documentation on a man with 20 or 30 significant front affiliations you don't have to go far during that period that he has never repudiated it.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course I am enough of a logician to see exactly what happened in this tract. They start with the conclusion, there is blacklisting. Then they built a syllogism around backward. This is done for the deliberate purpose of deceiving the people, in my opinion.

Mr. SCHMIDT. Whether they deliberately do it or whether they are infatuated with a wild and strange series of conclusions about what the first amendment grants, I wouldn't say. I am even willing to grant to them perfect sincerity in their way. After all, gentlemen, the fact that a man is sincere as a Nazi doesn't mean that we don't fight him.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Mr. SCHERER. I don't quite agree with your conclusion. I go back to the thing that I was driving at a little while ago. I think the group that sponsors the Fund for the Republic is trying to show that this committee basically is responsible for what they call blacklisting.

Mr. SCHMIDT. I think I agreed with that before. I don't think that you can remove that as one of the motivations here because it practically says so in many pages.

When they come to discussing AWARE, for example, and what I have done, you can see time and again they completely misrepresented what I have said. For instance, on page 154, volume II, they quote me as saying or quote my organization as saying:

Happily, AFTRA is one of the few unions in which flatly declared anti-communism and antitotalitarianism have won many clear victories.

That is the quotation.

Here is the comment:

The first statement, that AFTRA is "one of the few unions" in which anti-communism is dominant, was itself telltale.

We didn't say anything like that. We didn't say it was one of the few unions that was controlled by anti-Communists. We said it was one of the few unions where there were flatly declared statements of anticommunism. Again I say to you AFTRA or Actors Equity Association have beautiful statements that they are against communism and nazism. They even have a national rule that says that they are supposed to expel or that they can expel people who take the fifth amendment when they come before your committee. But I say to you what have they done on the basis of this? It is easy enough to make speeches in abstract against communism, but communism can't be fought merely in the abstract because communism is a kind of contagion that is carried by people. If you throw the searchlight of revelation on the people they run for cover because they are only used to the underside of things where things are hidden.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon. The witness is excused with the thanks of this committee.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p. m., July 13, 1956, the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, FRIDAY, JULY 13, 1956

(Members of the committee present: Representatives Walter and Kearney.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. McNamara, will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, would you pardon an interruption before Mr. McNamara's testimony. Mr. Riesel, who is one of the persons alleged by the Fund for the Republic report to be one of these so-called clearance men, was contacted by your staff with reference to a possible appearance before the committee. As the chairman and I believe everyone knows, Mr. Riesel has been suffering from blindness because of a horrible incident that occurred, and he said he would be unable to come but he sent down a very brief statement which he said he would like to have inserted in the record. I respectfully suggest that it be inserted in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(Mr. Riesel's statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY VICTOR RIESEL TO THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

I have never participated in any "clearance ring" dealing with persons in the entertainment industry.

I have never met with persons in the entertainment field to help "clear" themselves.

I have never issued "affidavits" on behalf of such persons seeking to "clear" themselves.

I have never made any entertainment figure "controversial" and then participated in any efforts to "clear" such controversial figures.

I resent the fact that the Fund for the Republic, Inc., never called me and never queried me about the statements they have published which refer to me. As a newspaperman I am appalled at the fact that they violated a basic concept of the profession and failed to check their story with the persons allegedly involved.

Mr. Hutchins and the directors of the Fund for the Republic shrewdly disclaimed all responsibility for the "facts" in Mr. Cogley's book on the entertainment industry. So do I.

The CHAIRMAN. Unfortunately, for the purpose of this hearing, the whip has just requested all Members to be on the floor of the House.

TESTIMONY OF FRANCIS J. McNAMARA

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am Francis J. McNamara. My residence is 5601 Glenwood Road, Bethesda, Md. I am presently employed as the director of the American Sovereignty Campaign of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, would you give us a thumbnail sketch of your personal background, your education, and the employments in which you have engaged?

Mr. McNAMARA. I attended St. Johns College in Brooklyn and received a B. A. degree there in 1938, and an M. A. from Niagara University in 1939. I was in military service from early 1941 until 1946. Subsequent to that time I served in China with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for a year. In 1948 I went to work for Counterattack. I worked in its research office for approximately 2 years and became editor of the newsletter in 1950. I remained in that position through April of 1954, when I came to Washington to take up my present work with the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly give us a word about Counterattack? What is Counterattack and what does it do?

Mr. McNAMARA. Counterattack is a weekly newsletter devoted to exposing and opposing Communist activity. It was established in the spring of 1947 and is still being published.

I might mention the fact that the men who established the newsletter all had formerly been associated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, while you were with Counterattack, were you ever approached by a representative of the Fund for the Republic in connection with its investigation of matters covered by the report on so-called blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. Not while I was with Counterattack, but I was approached after coming here to Washington. I don't recall the exact date. It might have been 8 or 10 months ago, or a year ago. Mr. Edward Engberg, who identified himself as a research associate of the Fund, called me and asked if he could come in to see me. I happened to be busy at the time and said not before the following week. He said he had to go back to New York the following day and asked if he could just talk to me for a few minutes and become acquainted before leaving, and then get in touch with me again later on. I agreed to that, and he came in to see me. He told me that because of the fact that I had been editor of Counterattack they were interested in interviewing me in connection with this study. He asked me if I would be willing to cooperate. I laid down one condition—that anything they asked me would be in writing and all my replies would be in writing.

Mr. ARENS. Why did you say that? Why did you make that condition?

Mr. McNAMARA. I explained to Mr. Engberg that I had nothing against him personally but I had, in effect, been burned on several occasions before by reporters and writers who came in to me and said that they wanted to write an objective study or account of this problem. I was interviewed and then, in the work they published on the basis of the interview, they distorted facts, misquoted, and so on. I was simply interested in protecting myself and having it all on the record in black and white.

Mr. ARENS. Then what happened after you laid down as a condition of the interview that the questions and answers all be in writing?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. Engberg seemed to assent to that. This was a brief introductory interview, that is all. He had to leave for New York, and he said that he would be in touch with me again when he came down to Washington. He never did get in touch with me again, and I was never interviewed in connection with this study.

Mr. ARENS. By any person?

Mr. McNAMARA. No one at all. This seems strange to me in view of the fact that the Fund report relies so extensively on anonymous sources and I was willing to be quoted.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, I invite your attention to volume II of the Fund for the Republic report on so-called blacklisting, in which in the early part of the report a number of allusions are made to Counterattack. Specifically I invite your attention to the second full paragraph beginning on page 4, in which there are listed a number of statements pertaining to Counterattack, and ask you if you have any observations with respect to those statements.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe you are referring to this statement on page 4:

Counterattack sometimes seems compelled to condemn activities that many Americans feel are the normal manifestations of free political debate.

Then he lists these items:

A petition to gain clemency for the Rosenbergs, or have the Supreme Court decide on the constitutional issues in the Hollywood Ten case. * * *

I flatly deny that Counterattack has ever done anything like this, and I charge that this is a false accusation. It is false because it suppresses an essential fact. Neither I nor anyone associated with Counterattack ever opposed a simple petition to gain clemency for the Rosenbergs. What we opposed was support of or the signing of a petition that was Communist-organized, Communist-inspired, and designed to promote the Communist Party line. The same is true of the brief submitted to the Supreme Court in the case of the Hollywood Ten.

I can go on down this list of items he mentions. "A protest against" —

Mr. ARENS. Excuse me. I think you jumped one or two instances of censorship. Has Counterattack ever attacked anyone because of a feeling of censorship?

Mr. McNAMARA. No.

Mr. ARENS. The next item is a "steady concern for civil liberties." Has Counterattack to your knowledge ever attacked anyone or vilified anyone because that person had a steady concern for civil liberties?

Mr. McNAMARA. The answer to that is "no," and I might add this: As a matter of fact, Counterattack has repeatedly stressed the fact that

in all anti-Communist activities great concern must be given to civil liberties, that on no occasion is there justification for violating them.

Mr. ARENS. The next listing here against Counterattack on page 4 of the Cogley report is against Counterattack for attacking people because they want to study blacklisting. Have you ever attacked anyone because they wanted to study blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. That, too, is a false statement.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever attacked anyone, the next indictment against your organization is, because they want to study Government security measures?

Mr. McNAMARA. That, too, is false.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever attacked anyone on the basis of this next indictment, to quote from the report, because they protest atomic warfare?

Mr. McNAMARA. As stated there, no. I use those words because we did criticize people who did sign or support the Communist line, Communist-inspired statements opposing atomic warfare.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, are there other charges in this report, to which you would like to direct the committee's attention, of instances in which you would take issue with Mr. Cogley?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes, there are quite a few. I don't intend to try to cover all of them, but I think a few of the key items could be considered here.

First of all, on page 1, paragraph 3, volume II. He describes Red Channels, a book published by Counterattack in the spring of 1950. The general description is accurate. In addition to saying Red Channels identified various people with certain Communist fronts, in referring to these fronts he says:

They included organizations identified as subversive by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the California Un-American Activities Committee, and other official and private sources. Among the private sources were the authors of Red Channels themselves.

Then follows the same sort of criticism on page 7, paragraphs 2 and 3. He goes into the question of the problem of identifying Communist organizations. He mentions the fact that in its issue of December 19, 1947, Counterattack named 34 fronts not included by the AG, the Attorney General, which "ought to have been." A few months later it gave its readers a list of 192 fronts, 119 of which, it pointed out, did not appear on the Attorney General's list.

Again, on page 11, there is a similar implication that Counterattack, without good justification, was branding organizations as Communist or subversive. I refer to the end of paragraph 2 on page 11. After quoting a Counterattack article, he states:

It went on to cite the Committee for the First Amendment as a "front," and advised its readers to write their Congressmen in support of the House probe.

That is referring to this committee's investigation of Hollywood in 1947.

Again, on page 27, a similar implication is made. He is speaking of an organization called the Voice of Freedom Committee and a rally it held. At the end of the last full paragraph on page 27 there is this parenthetical statement:

This rally was also cited in Red Channels as a Communist undertaking.

The general tenor of all these references, as I read it, is to cast doubt on the accuracy of these citations by Counterattack. I challenge Mr. Cogley, now, if he can, to prove that Counterattack has ever named any organization as Communist without justification.

During the period that I was editor of the newsletter I named many organizations as Communist. To give one example, about a month ago this committee held hearings on the Save Our Sons Committee, which was actually engaged in one of the dirtiest Communist operations ever performed in this country. That committee was organized at the end of October 1952, and in the issue of December 12, 1952—before it was 2 months old—I stated that that organization was a Communist front. I stand by that statement today. Within a week of the time it was formed, I named the American Peace Crusade as a Communist front in the issue of February 9, 1951. I stand by that accusation today and I point out that both this committee and the Attorney General have cited the American Peace Crusade.

The same applies to the Peace Information Center, the Labor Youth League, the American Veterans for Peace, the Union of New York Veterans, and many other organizations which I stated were Communist. I can say without any question that various committees, the Attorney General, have in nearly all cases upheld what I have said.

I think if Mr. Cogley can disprove any claim made by Counterattack he should come forward and do it and not try to give the impression by sly implication that we have been making unwarranted charges.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, does Counterattack engage in blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. The answer to that question is "No." I would, if I might, prefer to put off the answer to that question until I have covered a few more of the key points here.

Mr. ARENS. Go right ahead. I didn't mean to anticipate you.

Mr. McNAMARA. These are points where they go off the beam. I think this is an important point, the question of whether or not a private individual or organization can name an organization as a Communist front with justification and accuracy.

First of all, some years ago this committee published a Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications. On page 5 of the preface to this guide the committee gives a number of criteria which the average individual can use to judge and determine whether or not an organization is Communist. On pages 6 and 7 it also lists 14 criteria laid down by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. It is interesting to note here that Hoover's exact words in giving these criteria were:

There are easy tests to establish the real character of such organizations.

In other words, this is not an extremely difficult thing to do.

I have here a reprint of an article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram, Thursday, January 29, 1948, about 2 months after the Attorney General issued and made public the first subversive list. This was written by Frederick Woltman. The headline, "Many Top Fronts of Commies Left Out of United States List."

He pointed out that more than 70 groups were missing from this first roster. This was an accurate listing. Here is a case where a responsible reporter, a man who had won a Pulitzer prize for his work in this field, with the approval of the Scripps-Howard papers, had taken it upon himself to name organizations as Communist, and I say

this today: What he gave at that time still stands as true. He could have been sued by the key officials of any one of these organizations. He was not.

I would like to point out the fact that when the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee held its first rally in January 1953 in New York City, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, an organization of liberal, anti-Communist intellectuals, issued a public charge that this organization was Communist. It called on a number of professors and clergymen to disassociate themselves from this affair. Its charge in reference to the ECLC has since been upheld by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. It was an accurate charge. It was a fair charge.

I think that in doing this the American Committee for Cultural Freedom was performing a valuable and patriotic service, just as Counterattack was doing when it named organizations as Communist as soon as they were formed. It was alerting people to a Communist fraud, doing what it could to see that the American people would not be sucked into these groups or used by them to aid communism.

On page 7 Mr. Cogley says that the whole issue here was—

whether the American public would accept a private group, however, knowledgeable, fair, careful or scrupulous it might be, which compiled its own list of subversive organizations and then put the considerable public pressure at its disposal to force anyone associated with the organization at any time to "explain" his association or suffer the consequences.

That issue, I think, has been settled. It has been settled by the American Committee for Cultural Freedom and the fact that the public has accepted Counterattack, the American Legion, the Scripps-Howard publications, and other papers which have named organizations as Communist and called upon certain people to explain their associations with them. There has been no outcry or rebellion against this on the part of the American people.

Another point: On page 2 Mr. Cogley makes the following statement, referring to Counterattack:

Its underlying thesis—that Communists were "infiltrating" the radio-TV field and should be removed—became something of a doctrine in the industry.

Then on page 19, in the last paragraph, there is this statement, referring to the stated purpose for which Red Channels was published; he says:

The first purpose begs two questions: Did the Communists have a "plan of infiltration"? The word "infiltration" is vague at best—

and so forth.

In other words, in these two quotations he is raising doubt as to the accuracy of Counterattack's position that there was Communist infiltration in the broadcasting industry.

When J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee in 1947 he made the following statement:

The party—

referring to the Communist Party—

has departed from depending upon the printed word as its medium of propaganda and has taken to the air. Its members and sympathizers have not only infiltrated the airways but they are now persistently seeking radio channels.

Again, in 1950, he made the following statement before the same committee:

Many Communist fellow travelers and stooges have been able to secure positions enabling them to actually control personnel and production.

And he was here talking about radio and TV programs.

He also stated the Communist Party was setting up schools to teach writing, acting, and directing in radio-TV work.

In the American Legion Magazine, December 1950, Louis Budenz wrote an article in which he revealed that in 1943 the Communist Party set up a special commission to direct infiltration of the broadcasting field. He pointed out that Alexander Trachtenberg, V. J. Jerome, A. A. Heller, Joe Brodsky, and himself were members of this commission.

As a matter of fact, Cogley takes cognizance of this on page 143, volume II, when he states—this is the opening paragraph:

In the fall of 1952 a partial transcript of testimony given before the Senate Internal Subcommittee was made public.

He quotes a statement from it referring to this Communist Party commission set up in 1943.

In other words, he was aware, evidently, of the article by Budenz. He certainly should have been aware of J. Edgar Hoover's testimony. But he chooses to give the impression that it is an open question still of whether or not the Commies have ever tried to infiltrate broadcasting.

I think that the American public will accept the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover and the word of Louis Budenz rather than the implications of Mr. Cogley on this point.

On page 5, volume II, in the second paragraph, referring to Counterattack, he makes this statement:

If, for instance, actor T has been cited as belonging to organization P which has been cited by the California Tenney Committee as subversive, Counterattack does not take a great chance when it states the fact. It sometimes happens that actor T actually did not belong to organization P, or it sometimes happens that organization P was not actually subversive in any meaningful sense despite the Tenney committee—but Counterattack has fulfilled its obligation, it feels, when it reports what the Tenney committee had to say about organization P and actor T.

He says here it sometimes happens that actor T does not belong. Again, inasmuch as that is a completely unsupported statement, I think it is an unfair allegation and I flatly deny it. I challenge him to produce one instance in which Counterattack did this, stated in effect that a certain individual belonged to an organization when he didn't, or where we accepted a Tenney committee citation of an organization as a front when the organization was not a front at all.

I might point out in this respect that on one occasion Counterattack disagreed with the citation of a certain organization by the Tenney committee. We challenged its listing of one group, the National Institute of Arts and Letters. We felt that it did not fill the definition of a front. But at no time in Counterattack itself or in Red Channels did we connect anyone with an organization that had been incorrectly accused of being a Communist front by the Tenney committee or by any other committee.

He repeats the same charge in the following paragraph. I think I have answered that.

One point which Mr. Cogley raises in his report and which I think is very important is the one, on pages 7 and 8 of volume II.

This question goes to the matter of the accuracy and the reliability of sources used not only by Counterattack, but by this committee and many other organizations fighting communism in this country, namely, the reliability of the Daily Worker and the letterheads of Communist fronts as indications of Communist activity on the part of various individuals.

He refers to a story published in Counterattack under the headline "Red Front Uses Phony Sponsor List." In this story Counterattack brought out the fact that after investigating or looking into a letterhead of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and writing to some of the people named as sponsors on that letterhead, it received letters of denial and letters stating that the individuals concerned had called upon the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee years before to drop their names. I think the fact that Counterattack did this is a tribute to Counterattack. This article was published after I left the organization, but I happened to be the one who saw this letterhead, who went over the names very carefully, and recognized the names of individuals who I knew, because of my close study, had not been associated with Communist fronts for quite a period of years and who in some cases had taken public anti-Communist stands.

I wrote to the people named here. Yehudi Menuhin, Pierre Monteux, the conductor; Hazel Scott and her husband; Representative Adam Clayton Powell; the composer Leonard Bernstein; Bartley C. Crum, and so on.

I pointed out that I had this list, that I felt that what the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was doing was just using today a letterhead that was many years old. I thought if this was true, it was something that should be exposed. All the replies didn't come in until after I left the organization, and that is when the story was published.

I think this story is something that was good to write, and it reflects the integrity of Counterattack, the carefulness with which it looked into things before it made any charges.

He, however, uses it as a vehicle for attacking the reliability of information used by Counterattack.

"This is a phony letterhead," he implies. "How can you believe anything that Counterattack prints when it relies on letterheads?"

I would like to make a few observations on that.

There is a similar criticism on page 19, volume II:

It should be remembered that nearly all of the official documents cited by the professional anti-Communists are tabulations of names made by the Communists themselves. No hearings have been held to determine whether or not the use of these names was authorized.

I would just like to point out that there is no reason for the Daily Worker, when it reports today that at a rally two evenings ago in Madison Square Garden or some place like that, so and so got up and made a speech and when it quotes what he said—there is no reason for it to lie, to falsify, to say that a man spoke at this rally or appeared at it when he never did. You see, it is absolutely necessary for the success of the conspiracy that the Daily Worker

have a certain integrity. If it engaged in wholesale falsehoods the party members themselves would lose faith in the Daily Worker, and the Daily Worker is the medium through which the party must get its directives to its members. So, although the Communists have no morality themselves or devotion to high principles and so on, they must of necessity maintain a certain integrity in the news and in the facts published in the Daily Worker. This applies not only when they are giving an account of the rally held some days before, but when they are naming people who have signed a Communist brief or statement or were supporting a Communist front, giving their names as sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN. Incidentally, did you know that the Daily Worker is printing this report in a series of articles?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; praising the Fund for the Republic report. Yesterday and the day before I know that David Platt devoted his whole column to plugging this report.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the third day.

Mr. McNAMARA. The same thing applies to Communist-front letterheads. If Communist fronts adopted the practice of just pulling names out of hats and putting them on their letterheads without permission, the value of these letterheads would soon be lost. The party members themselves would lose confidence in them. There would eventually be protests. People would learn that these letterheads were all phonies, that they have no meaning, and therefore they would get no response. This of course would defeat the very purpose of these organizations. Their value lies in the fact that the people whose names are on their literature actually do support them.

If, as some people have repeatedly claimed, the Communist Party merely pulls its sponsors' names out of a hat and puts them on its front letterheads without permission then we are faced with this question: Why is it that names like that of Bing Crosby and other people who are top stars in the entertainment field and have great pulling power—why is it that we have never seen their names on a single Communist front or on several Communist fronts?

Mr. KEARNEY. You can go beyond the name of Bing Crosby. You can take George Murphy and Adolphe Menjou and hundreds of others out there of which that is true.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true. I have given only one example. There are numbers of them, not only in Hollywood but in all fields, athletics, business, and so forth. I, of course, have never been in the party myself or in a front, in an executive position or any other, but I have tried in talking with people who are former Communists to find out whether the party ever made it a practice to falsify a letterhead and a name, and I have been assured that to the best of the knowledge of these people who were once Communists and who worked in fronts, that that was not the practice. The party in setting up a letterhead never just took a name out of a hat. It either wrote to the individual or called him on the telephone before putting the name down, with this exception: If they tried to reach Paul Robeson, for example, and he was out of town they would slap his name on, or someone else like him who was a Communist and who they knew without any question would support any front.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I interrupt? Then, according to the testimony of witnesses we have had here who have been asked directly the ques-

tion as to whether or not they gave permission for the use of their names on letterheads, they either begged the question or said they knew nothing about it.

In other words, they were not exactly telling the truth; were they?

Mr. McNAMARA. Well, you have to judge each case. If a man had been in 6 or 8 fronts and then he denied that he had ever given his name to another, I would be inclined to doubt his word. There is another possibility. A man could honestly forget that he had given his name to a front. If 10 years from now I was asked if I had attended this, that, or the other function of the VFW I could very well forget some because it is routine for me to go to many VFW functions, being in the organization.

Mr. KEARNEY. I could go along with you on that one.

Mr. McNAMARA. When a person was a tried and true fellow traveler, going on one front after another, it is very possible that he could forget the fact that he had been to a certain Communist-front rally or agreed to sponsor a certain front. So he can honestly get up before a committee and say, "I don't remember that I ever gave my name." It was the routine, habitual thing for him to do. It had no special significance.

I do not claim that no Communist front ever, under any circumstances, put the name of an individual or two on its letterhead without permission. It may have happened. The point I want to make is this: Granted, for the sake of argument, that on 1 or 2 occasions a front has put a person's name on a letterhead without permission, you still cannot justifiably claim that because of these 1 or 2 rare exceptions to the rule, a basic reliable research technique should be done away with. These are rare exceptions. It is not the usual thing at all. To say that just because it has happened on 1 or 2 occasions you must never refer to a Communist-front letterhead or the Daily Worker as a reliable source of information is ridiculous.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, in the course of these hearings on this subject there have been various definitions of blacklisting. Would you kindly tell us whether or not by any definition of blacklisting Counterattack has been engaged in that odious practice?

Mr. McNAMARA. We have been repeatedly accused of that, not only by Mr. Cogley but others, but we have not been engaged in blacklisting as such. The cry of blacklisting was raised by the Communist Party as soon as Counterattack and others went into the entertainment field—even before the publication of Red Channels—and told the unpleasant truth about certain people who were making big money in radio-TV, and that truth led to their being dismissed or fired.

This raising of the cry of "blacklist" is part of the semantic warfare the Communists have waged against all their enemies in this country for years. It is standard technique for Communists to seize words with pleasant, good, and noble connotations and attach those words to their agencies—"democracy," "peace," "people's democracy," "constitutional rights," and so on.

Then, on the other hand, they take words with evil or nasty connotations and pin them on their enemies—"Fascist," "reactionary," "Wall Street imperialists," "witch hunters," and so on. "Blacklist." This, too, is an example. The word has an unpleasant connotation. If they can pin it on people who are fighting Communists, then they

create the impression that everyone associated with the attempt to prevent Communist infiltration of the broadcasting industry is tainted, undemocratic. This is a form of guilt by word or name association.

I would like to note that on page 237 of volume II of the Jahoda study, which is a supplement to Mr. Cogley's report, near the top of the page there is a subsection, Views on "Blacklisting," in which it states:

"Blacklisting" is an ugly term. So ugly that it is freely used throughout radio and television only by those who condemn wholeheartedly the variety of practices and policies associated with the term.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever tried through Counterattack, as indicated in the foreword to this opus, to cause people to be disassociated from their jobs because they might be controversial?

Mr. McNAMARA. That all depends on what you mean by controversial. We have never said this: That So and So should be dropped because he is controversial. We have said So and So has been identified as a member of the Communist Party. So and So has been associated over a period of years with, it may be 5, 6, or a dozen—whatever it is—Communist-front organizations, and until he gives a satisfactory explanation of these associations he should not be employed in the industry.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever attacked people and tried to get them removed from their jobs because of their political opinions or political beliefs?

Mr. McNAMARA. The answer to that is "No."

I would like to refer to another point raised in this report, the question of politics. This is page 2 of volume II, the last paragraph:

Most significant, the acceptance of Red Channels meant that the radio-TV industry officially adopted the political point of view espoused by Counterattack.

Then he goes on, again referring to Counterattack's political evaluations. This is in the very opening of the book. That is a smear statement for the simple reason that Counterattack never espoused any political viewpoint. I was editor under a Democratic and under a Republican administration, and under both, on some occasions I praised individual Democrats and Republicans and the administration for certain actions they took about communism, and in other instances I was critical. But the people who owned Counterattack were of varied political beliefs. They did not represent any one party and at no time did Counterattack promote a political viewpoint in the usual sense of that word.

By the time you have finished reading this volume you see that Mr. Cogley refers repeatedly to the Communist Party as a legitimate political party or implies that that is what it is. So it may be possible that here he is referring to Counterattack's views on communism. I would just like to point out that that is a very unusual interpretation of the word "political."

Mr. ARENS. Have you read this report with some degree of care?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; I have, most parts of it.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your background and experience would you care to characterize whether or not this report is a literary or educational enterprise or presentation?

Mr. McNAMARA. I wouldn't call it educational. What I would say of this report is that it is an attempt to sell a particular viewpoint by

distortion, by slanted writing, by the suppression of certain key facts in some cases, and the inclusion of immaterial, irrelevant matters in others.

If I may, I would just like to go back to this question of blacklisting and Mr. Cogley's views of it. He has said before this committee that denying employment to a Communist Party member, a fellow traveler, one who employs the fifth amendment, or even a waiter because he was unfortunate enough to have a very homely face—so homely it would scare the clientele of a restaurant—that that is blacklisting. He said that "irrespective of the reason," and those are his exact words, firing people or denying them employment is "blacklisting." He said that blacklisting "may be justified, unjustified, wrong, or right," but he refused to commit himself on whether it was right or wrong to blacklist party members, and so forth.

I say that this is a ridiculous definition of blacklisting, but it fits in, of course, very well with the way the Communist Party uses the term. If his definition of blacklisting is correct, then blacklisting is generally used everywhere in the United States and the whole world; it is the policy of every business corporation or association, every group that employs people—and who can accept such a definition? According to his definition, the Air Corps would be blacklisting a man because, we will say, he was 6 foot 5 and weighed 250 pounds and he wanted to be a fighter pilot. He just doesn't have the physical qualifications. He can't fit in the plane. But if they denied him the "right," as the Fund would say or Mr. Cogley would say, to be a fighter pilot, they would be "blacklisting" him.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, may I interpose this question: On the basis of your extensive background and experience in the fight against communism and your association with those of like caliber, would you care to express before this committee whether or not a person who is a professed Marxist is ideologically equipped to make an objective study of this subject of so-called blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. I would say "No." And normally, if a foundation employed a person with a pronounced bias one way or the other to work on an objective study it would be criticized. The professed Marxist would naturally be interested in defending and helping other Marxists.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know that Mr. Michael Harrington who is or was the chief assistant to Mr. Cogley in the preparation of this report publicly described himself in publications of recent vintage as a Marxist?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am aware of that.

Mr. ARENS. Do you feel that a person who is a professed Marxist as of this date and as of the time of preparation of this report is ideologically equipped to discern the facts on Communist penetration and upon so-called blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not. He would naturally be biased in favor of Communists or Marxists.

Mr. ARENS. What distinction would you make ideologically between a Communist and a Marxist?

Mr. McNAMARA. On some occasions you do have a man who is an ideological Marxist who is not a Communist Party member. It may be, for example, that he was more or less revolted by some of the

things Stalin did, because of the atrocities, and so on, and he refused to affiliate himself formally with the Communist Party.

Mr. ARENS. But his basic concepts are the same as those of a Communist?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. That man hopes that the Soviet Union will reform itself, will purify its communism according to his ideas, and therefore he would never want to see the Soviet Union destroyed because he sees it as the one hope of bringing to the world his fundamental Marxist beliefs. He will try perhaps to influence or change some of the things that are done. Today such people undoubtedly are rejoicing at the repudiation of Stalin which is going on but at the same time if it came to a showdown between the two forces, the anti-Communist and the Marxists in the world, I think the ideological Marxist would naturally be strongly tempted to go with the other side, with the side of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ARENS. If you were engaged as the expert that you are in communism to make a study of employment practices relating to Communists and fellow travelers, would you enlist as your chief assistant a person who is and was a professed Marxist?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, I would not.

Mr. ARENS. Who in his writings says, "We Marxists"?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, I would not.

Mr. ARENS. Why wouldn't you?

Mr. McNAMARA. Because I do not believe that such a man would be able to look at the situation objectively. He would naturally be opposed to the elimination of Marxists—whether they were Stalinists or not—from the radio-TV industry and other positions of influence.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I ask this question: As far as blacklisting is concerned, so-called blacklisting, couldn't they very well charge the Federal Government on form 57 with blacklisting when you have to swear to an affidavit that you don't belong to a party that is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence?

Mr. McNAMARA. They could and they do. That is the danger, I think, in the Cogley report, that it gives a definition, so far as it goes in that respect—

Mr. KEARNEY. Pardon me for interrupting. What I am getting at is that they could very well accuse the United States Government of blacklisting.

Mr. McNAMARA. They do. They also accuse this committee of being a blacklisting committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. We have been accused of many things.

Mr. McNAMARA. I realize that. The Cogley definition, so far as it exists and is fairly definable, helps the party in this respect. I would like to mention on the question of blacklisting this point, too: That your better business bureaus, the retail credit agency, Dun & Bradstreet, and so on, "blacklist" all types of people every day. The "victim" doesn't know it. When they give a very low credit rating that is, in effect, a blacklist. It destroys a man's financial opportunities. It has a tremendous effect on his future and that of his whole family. This is extralegal. No hearings are granted.

I am not saying this to be critical of these organizations. I think they have done a tremendous job. They actually have protected thousands of people from being swindled and making bad deals and invest-

ments. They have prevented heartbreak and so on. They perform a real service. I contend that the people who are engaged in what the Fund for the Republic calls blacklisting are doing the same thing. They are just making available to the public for its consideration the records of certain people—exposing fraudulent goods.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, you are appearing here today not only because of your prior connection with Counterattack, but also because you are presently associated in very important work with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Do you care to express to this committee the position and attitude of that great veterans' organization with respect to trying to keep Communists and those in the Communist web out of the entertainment industry?

Mr. McNAMARA. I can just state the position briefly, and it is this: That the Veterans of Foreign Wars has consistently supported the efforts of this and other committees to expose and eliminate Communists and fellow travelers from the entertainment industry and that it is still supporting that effort and is opposed to the hiring of such people.

One of the basic weaknesses in this report—you might call it an intellectual weakness—is this: All history indicates that every society has a certain minimum code of conduct, and there is ostracism for those who break it. In the past many Hollywood stars have lost out completely, not because of any subversive affiliation but just because they did certain things which violated the code accepted by the American people. They were top stars one day, and the next day they were finished.

The industry, radio-TV, must acknowledge this code. It is a fact that it exists. It is legitimate and it is good. It is essential for internal order in this country, for peace, for all progress that has been made in the history of civilization. This code must exist. It has always existed. Those who defy it and who do not want to isolate themselves from society have only one choice. They must endure the censure that society imposes on those who break the code. The Fund just won't face this fact.

I would like to point out here an example of what Cogley would call blacklisting. This was done by a union. This is the American Guild of Variety Artists AGVA News of March 1952. On page 6, it features a "national unfair list." An introductory paragraph states:

Artists, employers, and agents are urged not to do business with any person or establishment appearing on the unfair list, nor to appear in any show in which a person on the unfair list is appearing. Every violation should be reported to AGVA in order that violations of AGVA's rules may be stopped—And so on and so forth.

Then it lists here—there must be several hundred citations of artists, agents, spots and attractions, owners and producers.

I am not opposed to this blacklist. I think it is legitimate. Unions are not the only ones who do it. Right-wing groups do it, liberal organizations, the National Committee for an Effective Congress, the AFL-CIO, and so on.

My point is that as long as an organization has legitimate interests and standards, it is fair for it to engage in such activity to see that those standards are upheld.

The fact that we have to face and which the Fund for the Republic won't face, evidently, is that Communists and fellow-travelers have

violated the standards of the American people. President Truman once denounced the Communist leaders as traitors.

On August 10, 1950, a full page ad was published in the New York Times. The ad was signed by many well-known Americans. Bill Mauldin, the famous GI cartoonist of World War II; Actress Madeleine Carroll; former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who was known as a liberal; Irving Berlin, Rube Goldberg, Raymond Massey, Howard Lindsay, Russell Crouse, Milton Caniff, and 15 other people. This is what this ad said in part:

The war is on. The chips are down. Those among us who defend Russia or communism are enemies of freedom and "traitors to * * * the United States."

This is the basic issue here, the basic issue which Cogley studiously avoids. The era he covers in this book is largely the era of the Korean war. Yet he never brings up this issue. That was the issue. Some of the people in Red Channels were people who, even during the Korean war, were openly siding with the Communist Party which took the side of Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me show you what the Daily Worker does with this report and the testimony concerning the activities of Victor Riesel, George Sokolsky, and Frederick Woltman, with respect to advising people how to relieve themselves of an unpleasant situation that they place themselves in. This editorial in the Daily Worker today says:

AWARE has a "clearance" program all its own. It has published a guide on the subject called The Road Back. It discusses how the truly repentant can be recognized. The book lists 12 suggested steps in the process of rehabilitation.

This is what the Daily Worker says about these steps:

They are 12 steps in the making of an informer.

This is the way a twist has been placed in order to discredit the constructive work done by some fine Americans and American organizations.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am sure the chairman didn't expect to get any truth out of the Daily Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't expect to get any truth, but every day I learn something by reading it.

Mr. McNAMARA. The question of civil liberties has featured very prominently in all the discussion of blacklisting in this book. All through it you get the impression that Counterattack and Red Channels and I, inasmuch as I was editor of Counterattack for 4½ years, have no respect for civil liberties and of course in that respect no regard for people.

I would like to point out that Prof. A. O. Lovejoy, the founder of the American Association of University Professors, in 1949 made the following statement:

[The] conception of freedom is not one which implies the legitimacy and inevitability of its own suicide. * * * what it implies is that there is one kind of freedom which is inadmissible—the freedom to destroy freedom.

In other words, no American has the right and he is not exercising freedom, he is abusing it, when he supports the Communist Party and its fronts.

The issue is as simple as that. What has astonished me more or less is that in all this discussion which is going on there is so much concern for the alleged civil liberties of Communists and fellow travelers

and none for the liberties of the great mass of the American people, the overwhelming majority of the 165 million people in this country, who are anti-Communists, and I am referring to their right to protect themselves, their families and their country against this conspiracy to destroy their basic rights and the form of government on which those rights rest.

They have a right to defend themselves not only against the hard core of the conspiracy, but all its agents, knowing or unknowing, by taking positive action against everyone who threatens their way of life, their very existence and the well-being of their families. They have a right to refrain from supporting anyone who serves this conspiracy, either because he is a conscious instrument or because he is such a sloppy, indifferent citizen that he or she cannot be bothered to check and find out whether or not what he is doing is a violation of his fundamental duties as a citizen; namely, aiding the destruction of all that is worthwhile and which this Nation represents.

I will go further and say that when a citizen knows these conditions exist—the infiltration by a conspiracy, and so forth—he has an obligation and a duty to take action against it, to do everything he possibly can, and when he remains indifferent and does nothing he is in a sense actually guilty of betraying his heritage and the cause of freedom.

Mr. KEARNEY. If I may interrupt there, in the years that I have been on this committee I have come to the conclusion that the only ones who are supposed to have any civil rights or civil liberties in this country are not the vast majority of the American people but the hard core of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is what it amounts to. I think this isn't accidental. It has been developed. I honestly think that the Fund for the Republic if it had gone into the facts—it is supposed to be interested in civil liberties—could have done a lot of good. If, instead of using sly innuendoes and slanted writing to imply that people who are active in so-called blacklisting are reprehensible it would actually praise these people, the networks and advertising agencies and other organizations and individuals who, the best they could, were fighting Communist infiltration of the broadcasting industry, it would not be used as a propaganda device by the Communist Party in its effort to destroy this country, and they would have been performing a real service. Unfortunately they have done just the opposite.

I think this inordinate interest in the rights of Communists is due in part to the fact that in the fall of 1952 Stalin issued a directive to Communists in all parts of the Western World to "raise higher the banner of bourgeois civil liberties." That was 4 years ago. They have had 4 years to work and agitate along this line. Last August at a meeting of top Communist Party brass in New York, Claude Lightfoot, who has been convicted under the Smith Act, called upon all members of the party and fellow travelers to conduct a "national crusade"—those were his words—a "national crusade" to stop all effective anti-Communist action under the slogan "the struggle to preserve the Bill of Rights."

As usual, the party hasn't had great success with this theme among the American people as a whole. There has been no grassroots outcry that because communism is being fought, everyone's civil liberties

are being destroyed. But as usual, too, there is a minority, a relatively small group of people, usually self-proclaimed liberals, who have fallen for this line. I don't believe they are doing it wittingly. They are raising this big fuss. They have been affected by this propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not do it wittingly, but they think it is clever. It satisfies some sort of inferiority complex to sit around and criticize people who have gotten into the position that they aspire to attain but never can and never do. That is the answer.

Mr. ARENS. Have you any other comments to make, Mr. McNamara?

Mr. McNAMARA. I just happened to think of this: Some time ago I was referring to the Fund's attack on the reliability of the information used by Counterattack, this committee, and others who fight communism, namely, the Daily Worker, the front letterheads, and so on. In Counterattack issue of March 2, 1951, I stated that the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, a Communist front, was willing to give performers in the radio-TV field a lying letter to the effect that they had never been associated with the NCASP, even if they had been.

This, I believe, was part of the Commies' plan, or attempt, if it could, to cast doubt on the trustworthiness of letterheads of Communist-front organizations and therefore the reliability of this committee in certain of its reports, of Counterattack, and Red Channels. I stated this:

Those who have been affiliated with the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions (NCASP), for example, can get in touch with J. JULIUS JOSEPH at Council's hqs. in N. Y. City. (JOSEPH was named by ELIZABETH BENTLEY as a member of CP and of Washington espionage ring * * * she said he, while in OSS, cooperated in getting information from Govt. files for Soviet agents.)

"Knuckling down to reaction won't help matters," JOSEPH may say (as he already has) to convey a gentle reprimand when a request for clearance is made. But, if the caller persists, JOSEPH will agree to supply a letter stating that the NCASP used his or her name in its literature and press releases without obtaining permission to do so.

I think this illustrates the extent to which the Communist Party has gone in its efforts to discredit the sources of information used by Counterattack, Red Channels, and others in fighting communism.

On the whole issue of blacklisting I think some of these exhibits, which show how extensively the Communists agitated about "blacklisting," may set this Fund for the Republic report in its proper setting.

This is a copy of the approved version of V. J. Jerome's speech to the 15th National Convention of the Communist Party in December 1950, published by New Century Publishers, a Communist publishing house. The title is "Grasp the Weapon of Culture." This speech was one of the counts which was included in Jerome's indictment when he was charged under the Smith Act with conspiring to teach the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. On page 16, column 2, first full paragraph of the approved version of the speech at the party convention he says this. This is 6 months after Red Channels was published:

Against the Fascist blacklist and censorship campaign spearheaded by Red Channels and Counterattack, there is gathering resentment which can be organized into a storm of protest—

and so on.

This man is one of the key people in the Communist Party as far as activities in the cultural field is concerned.

Here is another example of the conspiracy's "antiblacklist" campaign. I have referred to the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, a Communist front. In the fall of 1951, following Jerome's orders, this organization staged a series of rallies against the "blacklist." This is a flyer announcing one of those rallies:

"Stop the Blacklist," "How Counterattack Gets People Fired," and so on, reproductions of various headlines. The American Labor Party and other Communist fronts cooperated.

Here is another copy of the same flyer from this committee with a little attachment stapled to it:

Monitor Musts #1. VOF has pledged full support of its monitors for this meeting—

the same rally.

VOF is the Voice of Freedom Committee. When J. Edgar Hoover testified before the Appropriations Committee in 1950 he referred to this organization indirectly. He didn't name it. But in speaking of Communist attempts to move in on radio and TV he said that one front boasted of the fact that it had thousands of monitors all over the country who write letters of protest, and so on, to sponsors to kill anti-Communist commentators and speakers. This little note is signed by Stella Holt, who urges all members of the Voice of Freedom Committee, which the Attorney General has cited as subversive, to support this NCASP antiblacklist rally.

I have another interesting exhibit here. The party really went all out to sell this blacklist idea and to kill off those who were engaged in trying to stop and clear up the infiltration of the industry. Here is a flyer advertising a rally which was held on April 4, 1951, Wednesday, at the Hotel Sutton in New York. A rally to CRACK THE BACK OF COUNTERATTACK, sponsored by the advertising division, as I recall, of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. That ad asks:

What important art studio was put out of business within 1 week after it was BLACKLISTED by Counterattack?

This is a reference to a truthful story Counterattack published some months before this about an art studio in New York owned and riddled by Communists which had valuable contracts with many Government agencies and was making big money. All I did was write the truth about the organization. Within a few weeks it had lost all these contracts and was out of business. The party charges that Counterattack blacklisted the organization. It did no such thing. It told the truth.

Mr. ARENS. Did that epithet "blacklisting," which is used by the Communist Party antedate the Fund for the Republic's report on blacklisting?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. All this antedates the Fund for the Republic. It is very interesting to me that nowhere in this report—unless I have missed some important things, and I don't think I have—is there any reference to the concerted campaign which the Communist Party waged on this issue of blacklisting, its efforts to destroy everyone who was engaged in this work of exposing and ending the infiltration of the broadcasting industry.

Mr. ARENS. Is the term "blacklisting" as applied to the efforts of the anti-Communists to expose Communists in the entertainment industry a term which has been for some time in common use by the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. I couldn't pin it down to a month or anything like that, but I would say in the late forties when identified Communists began to be dropped by the movie, radio, and the TV industry, then this blacklist cry began. It was raised by the Communists and really whipped up.

Just one more comment in line with these rallies to end the blacklist that the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions staged. This is an exhibit from the Hollywood Reporter, November 13, 1950. The Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council in Hollywood, the Hollywood branch of the NCASP, had held an antiblacklist rally out there. In reply to this rally this full-page ad appeared in the Hollywood Reporter:

HOLLYWOOD REPUDIATES the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council. ***

The Motion Picture Industry Council emphatically denies that this organization or this meeting in any way represents Hollywood—

referring to this rally against blacklisting—

The motion-picture industry resents being identified with or judged by this or any group which fastens on this industry only to misrepresent and injure it.

It is signed by the Motion Picture Industry Council and its affiliated groups: Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood AFL Film Council, Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Independent Office Workers, Screen Actors Guild, Screen Directors Guild, Screen Producers Guild, Screen Writers Guild, Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors.

In other words, Hollywood as a whole, all the basic elements in the industry, have flatly repudiated this Communist effort to play this whole thing up as blacklisting and to say that it must be destroyed and eliminated. I think in doing so they were responding to the wishes and the desires of the American people.

The radio-TV industry in New York, where it is centered, is doing the same thing in its efforts to clear up and prevent any further Communist infiltration in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Communists are trying to do is to create the impression that exposure and blacklist are synonymous; isn't that it?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. As a matter of fact, the Fund for the Republic or Cogley report aids that basic Communist aim because when you have finished reading this book you get the impression, the strong impression, the impact of the whole book, that no one can do anything against communism without being a blacklister, without being kind of nasty and dirty.

What is the lesson? Therefore, no one should do anything about communism? Sit back, do nothing, give the Communists free rein. You might say that is the fundamental lesson that this book teaches.

I would like to make 1 or 2 comments on the book, the intellectual level of the book. Just one example. I refer to page 144, volume II. Some things in this book are actually fantastic. He is describing conservatives here. These are his exact words.

Mr. KEARNEY. When you say "he," whom do you mean?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am referring to Mr. Cogley, the author of the report. He is referring to conservatives and defining them. This is a parenthetical statement in the second paragraph, page 144:

"Anti-Communist but not right-wing." This is the definition of a conservative! Maybe I am crazy, but I have always heard conservatives referred to as right-wing people. He says a conservative is not a right-winger. What is a conservative? A left-winger? A person who says he is a middle-of-the-roader—is he a conservative? This defies common usage in the American language.

One other example of just how low he actually goes sometimes to discredit Counterattack. On page 80, volume II, the chapter in which he is referring to various commentators who have been tied up with Communist fronts:

Of the 10 radio newsmen listed in Red Channels, only Robert St. John, William L. Shirer, and Howard K. Smith, were network commentators of national reputation.

Then at the end of that sentence there is an asterisk denoting a footnote. The footnote is this:

Winston Burdett, CBS newsmen who testified in the summer of 1955 that he had once served briefly as a Soviet agent, was not listed.

Counterattack never made any claim that it knew every man in this Nation or any other place who had ever served as a Soviet agent, and this ridiculous footnote is introduced in the book for no reason except to try to discredit Counterattack and claim it knew nothing. How would anyone reasonably expect Counterattack to know in 1950 that Winston Burdett sometime in the past had been a secret agent of the Soviet Union? Ridiculous, but I think a good indication of the little tricks that Cogley uses throughout this book to attack anti-Communists, to make them look bad. There is a terrific contrast between the treatment he gives people who are fighting communism and the Communists themselves.

He will devote a whole chapter to Mr. Laurence A. Johnson, for instance, to Mr. Vincent Hartnett, to Jack Wren, and others, digging up every little item of gossip, rumor he can against them. The chapter on Mr. Johnson is just loaded with anonymous quotations of things people are alleged to have said about Johnson. Yet when he gets to discussing the actual Communists and fellow travelers who allegedly have been blacklisted he gives the minimum of evidence and often all he will say is that they were listed in Red Channels. If they have been identified by a dozen witnesses as party members, if they have taken the fifth amendment, no mention is made of that. All this is concealed. He suppresses as much vital information as he possibly can about the commies and fellow travelers and just loads the other side with nasty remarks, innuendoes, digging up every little item he can when writing about those who are fighting communism.

Mr. ARENS. What will be the impact, for good or evil, of this report by this very powerful and well-financed Fund in the fight against communism in the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. That all depends, of course, on its reception. If it is widely distributed and read and if people accept what it teaches—and it is possible that they might because this is so worded that vital

information is suppressed—then it will greatly aid the Communist Party. It can have no other effect. In effect, it pleads the party line, the party cause, in the question of radio and TV, the whole entertainment industry.

Mr. ARENS Mr. McNamara, is there another point you want to make before the committee?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; I think I have completed my statement.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Arens, how widely distributed or read are these reports?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Fund for the Republic report? I do not know just what distribution the Fund intends in the case of this report. I understand that it will be sold for \$1.25. There is no telling just what distribution it will ultimately receive.

The CHAIRMAN. If it doesn't sell, they will give it away. They will see that it is distributed.

Mr. McNAMARA. They have done that in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. McNAMARA. They have distributed free copies of various things they have promoted. Usually in the case of books it is no more than a thousand copies. But the thing is, it goes to key people, people in the best position to influence public opinion.

If you can influence those people in the wrong way, then, of course, through them you can influence thousands and thousands of others.

The CHAIRMAN. Like this Griswold's slanted book and discussion of the fifth amendment. It went to every United States district attorney and every judge in the United States. It was accidental, of course, but that was the distribution, free distribution.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. McNamara, I think this is a fair question to you as a person who is an expert in the field of fighting communism. Is this report an objective, scholarly, educational report, or is it, on the other hand, of the propaganda variety?

Mr. McNAMARA. I would say it is definitely propaganda. I think I said before that it is not an objective study. There is not a full presentation of all sides. Certain vital facts are suppressed. It is slanted writing, innuendo, hints, and so forth, to sell a definite point of view. It is not objective.

If I may, just one more point. The attempt to discredit Red Channels. If he had been interested at all in giving the full facts he would have pointed out—for instance, he repeatedly claims that Red Channels is the bible of Madison Avenue, that it was so used that no one in it could get any work at all, and so forth. In the September 13, 1950, issue of Counterattack the following statement appeared:

Red Channels was not meant to be used as a "blacklist" in the industry.

In other words, Counterattack carefully pointed out that it never meant the book to be used as an automatic blacklist, that no one named in that book was ever to be used. As a matter of fact, a paragraph or two later, this statement:

Counterattack knows of many instances in recent months where Red Channels listees have appeared on radio and TV programs.

This statement was made in rebuttal of the claim of some newspapers that Red Channels had become the bible of Madison Avenue and that it was a complete and thorough blacklist. Counterattack

never protested the appearance of many of the persons referred to above whose Communist-front records were documented in Red Channels.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask this question at this point: Is Counterattack a tax-exempt organization?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. KEARNEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. KEARNEY. I appreciate very much the testimony you have given, Mr. McNamara. It contrasts to some of the other testimony we have received.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It is very refreshing to receive the testimony of those who have no axes to grind.

Mr. ARENS. We have no other witnesses for today, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing is adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 3:35 p.m., Friday, July 13, 1956, the committee was recessed subject to call of the Chair.)

×



3 9999 05706 3248

| | | |
|-------|------|---------------------|
| a | 3249 | refl seit pt 6 |
| b c d | 3240 | blacklisting pt 1-3 |
| e m | 3241 | pros. Sander pt 52 |
| f | 3242 | fund for republic |
| g | 3243 | Tillich |
| h i | 3244 | New Haven pt 1 |
| j | 3245 | LA pt 11 |
| k | 3246 | subversion diplo |
| l | 3247 | Kennystown |

